

Yury Arzhanov

Porphyry, *On Principles and Matter*

Scientia Graeco-Arabica

Herausgegeben von
Marwan Rashed

Band 34

Yury Arzhanov

Porphyry,
On Principles and Matter

A Syriac Version of a Lost Greek Text with an English
Translation, Introduction, and Glossaries

DE GRUYTER

ISBN 978-3-11-074577-1
e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-074702-7
ISSN 1868-7172

Library of Congress Control Number: 2021940470

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2021 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston
Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck
Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com

Acknowledgements

My acquaintance with the Syriac text of the treatise published in the present volume became possible due to the generous help of Elizabeth Sobczynski, the founder and Chief Executive of the London-based Levantine Foundation. Her long-term project on the preservation and conservation of manuscripts in the Coptic monastery Dayr al-Suryan in Egypt made the majority of the codices still held in the monastery library available to scholars. I was lucky to accompany her and her colleagues during two preservation campaigns, in December 2016 and November 2019, when a team of conservators began working on a number of Syriac manuscripts. Before 2016 ms. DS 27 was not in good shape; but, fortunately, it was among those codices which were chosen to be stabilised, thus making it possible for me to read it. Bishop Mattheos gave his blessing to my visits to the monastery and my work with Syriac manuscripts, providing another key which opened the doors of Dayr al-Suryan's library to me. Both the former librarian, Abouna Bigoul, and his young successor, Abouna Amoon, supported me in my work. Thus, my special thanks go to the monks of the Dayr al-Suryan, who kept their precious codices, and to Ms. Sobczynski and the Levantine Foundation, who for many years have organised the work of conserving and stabilising them.

I would like to thank Lucas Van Rompay, whose description of ms. DS 27 in the catalogue of 2014, prepared together with Sebastian Brock, attracted my attention to this interesting codex for the first time. Prof. Van Rompay generously provided me with his copy of several folios of ms. DS 27, which he made for his private use.

I owe a lot to my conversations with Jonathan Greig, who helped me to better understand many passages in the philosophical treatise published in this volume. Parts of this book were also discussed with John Dillon, Andrew Smith, John Watt, George Karamanolis, Carlos Steel, and Alexandra Michalewski.

Sami Aydin and Martin Heimgartner read the draft version of my edition and translation and made multiple critical notes, which allowed me to avoid plenty of errors and to improve the translation of the treatise. However, it goes without saying that the positions taken and any shortcomings in the following text remain mine alone.

It is my pleasure to thank Marwan Rashed for including my book in his series (hopefully it will one day have the title, "Scientia Graeco-Syro-Arabica"); Florian Ruppenstein from the publishing house, De Gruyter, for setting the book's layout; and Penelope Hay for proof-reading the English text.

Finally, I would like to thank my wife, Olga, for her constant support for my work and for inspiring me on new discoveries.

Preface

The Syriac treatise published in this volume is in many respects a unique text. Though it has been preserved anonymously, there remains little doubt that it belongs to Porphyry of Tyre. Accordingly, it enlarges our knowledge of the views of Plotinus' famous disciple. The text is an important witness to Platonist discussions of First Principles and of Plato's concept of Prime Matter in the *Timaeus*. It contains extensive quotations from Atticus, Severus, and Boethus, and thus provide us with new textual witnesses to these philosophers, whose legacy remains very limited. Additionally, the treatise is a rare example of a Platonist work preserved in the Syriac language. Syriac reception of Plato and Platonic teachings has left rather scant traces, and the question of what precisely Syriac Christians knew about Plato and his philosophy remains a debated issue. The treatise provides new evidence of the close acquaintance of Syriac scholars with Platonic cosmology and with philosophical commentaries on the *Timaeus*.

Before turning to the description of the Syriac text, some preliminary notes are necessary:

The author: The text has come down to us without the author's name. However, the latter calls himself a disciple of Longinus and Plotinus, and thus it is most probable that the treatise derives from Porphyry of Tyre. Comparison with extant fragments of Porphyry's writings leaves no doubt that the treatise goes back to Plotinus' disciple.

The title: The Syriac text has been preserved without title. The comparison with the extant evidence of, and about, Porphyry's writings does not allow one to identify with certainty the Syriac version as part of any known Greek work of this author. The treatise focuses on two topics: First Principles and Prime Matter evaluated in the light of Plato's *Timaeus*. Thus, in order to give an idea of the contents of this Syriac text, it is published as Porphyry's *On Principles and Matter* (abbreviated as *PM*).

The main aim of this book is the publication of the Syriac text, making it available for specialists in late ancient philosophy. Hence, it is not meant to provide an exhaustive commentary on the details of the text, but it does seek to establish the evidence necessary to demonstrate that the text belongs to Porphyry. It is hoped that with the release of this edition, the important work of elaborating multiple details within the text will be taken up by historians of philosophy and Porphyry scholars.

The structure of the Introduction reflects the main purpose of the book, i.e. the publication of the Syriac version of the treatise. The Introduction contains two parts, the first of which suggests a detailed description of the preserved text and tries to contextualize it within the history of Syriac literature. The second part gives an

overview of the contents of the treatise and lists its main arguments, allowing one to ascribe the Greek source to Porphyry with great certainty. The glossary at the end of the book is an attempt to reconstruct the terminology of the Greek original, which is based on the extant ancient Syriac translations from the Greek.

Transliteration: Syriac words are vocalized according to the East Syriac vocalization system, but long and short vowels remain undifferentiated.

Table of Contents

Introduction

- 1 The Syriac Text and its History — 3
 - 1.1 Description by Timothy I (d. 823) — 3
 - 1.2 Treatise in Ms. Dayr al-Suryan Syr. 27 (9th cent.) — 5
 - 1.3 Epitome by Barhebraeus (d. 1286) — 10
 - 1.4 Natural Philosophy in Syriac Schools — 14
 - 1.5 Time and Background of the Syriac Translation — 26
- 2 The Treatise — 38
 - 2.1 The Structure of the Text — 38
 - 2.2 The Doxography (Part 1, §§1–16) — 41
 - 2.3 Introductory Issues (Part 2, §§17–28) — 47
 - 2.4 Definition of First Principles and Matter (Parts 3 and 4, §§29–67) — 51
 - 2.5 Various Interpretations of Plato's *Timaeus* (Part 5, §§73–97) — 56
 - 2.5.1 Atticus — 57
 - 2.5.2 Severus — 61
 - 2.5.3 Longinus and Boethus — 63
 - 2.6 Porphyry as the Author of the Treatise — 66
- 3 Conclusion — 79

Porphyry, *On Principles and Matter*: Syriac Text and English Translation — 81

Syriac and Greek Glossary — 125

Syriac Glossary — 128

Greek Glossary — 157

Proper Names — 164

Bibliography — 165

General Index — 179

References — 183

Introduction

1 The Syriac Text and its History

1.1 Description by Timothy I (d. 823)

The earliest reference to the Syriac treatise *On Principles and Matter* (hereafter: *PM*) dates from the last decades of the eighth century AD. At that time, Timothy I, who had just assumed his position as the head of the Church of the East (East Syrian Catholicos-Patriarch between 780–823)¹, wrote a letter to Mar Pethion, the head of the school of the monastery of Mar Abraham at Bashosh near Mosul². Pethion died in 782/783, so that it must have been 781 or early 782 when Timothy wrote his letter, asking Pethion to do him a favor and to search for a number of books³.

The place where these books could have been found was not the East Syriac monastery of Mar Abraham where Pethion lived, but the West Syriac convent Mar Mattai, which was situated not far from Mosul and possessed a large library⁴. Timothy asked Pethion to make his inquiries concerning books secretly, for he supposed that, if his request became public, the Syrian Orthodox community would not be eager to share their book treasures with the head of the Church of the East.

Timothy's first years as Catholicos were marked by active scholarly work. Following the request of the caliph al-Mahdi, Timothy (who had received a solid training in the school of Pethion's predecessor, Abraham bar Dashandad⁵) started to translate Aristotle's *Topica* into Arabic⁶. The difficulties in understanding this Aristotelian

1 For Timothy I, see especially Berti, *Vita e studi di Timoteo I*. See further Heimgartner, "Der ostsyrische Patriarch Timotheos I. (780–823) und der Aristotelismus".

2 Letter 43 in the collection of letters of Timothy. The Syriac text has been preserved in ms. Baghdad, Chaldean Monastery 509 (dated to 1299), which served as the basis for a number of later copies; cf. Heimgartner, *Die Briefe 42–58: Textedition*, vii–xii. The Syriac text of Letter 43 was published twice on the basis of the modern copies of the Baghdad codex: Braun, "Briefe", 4–11 (Syriac with a German transl.); Pognon, *Une version syriaque*, xvi–xx (Syriac with a French transl.). Sebastian Brock published an English translation of it: Brock, "Two Letters of the Patriarch Timothy", 235–237. The modern critical edition of the letter is: Heimgartner, *Die Briefe 42–58: Textedition*, 65–68. German translation: Heimgartner, *Die Briefe 42–58: Übersetzung*, 47–52.

3 For the date of the letter, see Berti, *Vita e studi di Timoteo I*, 50–62; Heimgartner, *Die Briefe 42–58: Übersetzung*, li.

4 Cf. Berti, "Libri e biblioteche cristiane nell'Iraq".

5 Cf. Berti, *Vita e studi di Timoteo I*, 122–132.

6 Timothy writes that he worked together with the scholar Abu Nuḥ and that he himself translated only part of the text from Syriac into Arabic, while Abu Nuḥ finished the translation. Timothy's description of this project is not quite clear and it has caused various interpretations of it. Cf. Heimgartner, *Die Briefe 42–58: Übersetzung*, 47–48, n. 219.

his detailed description of the treatise¹⁰. This situation changed in 2014, when Sebastian Brock and Lucas Van Rompay published a catalogue of Syriac manuscripts now preserved in the Egyptian monastery Dayr al-Suryan¹¹. The authors of the catalogue did not notice the similarity between one of the items in ms. 27 and the text referred to in Timothy's letter. However, their description of the codex included the *incipit* of a treatise, which coincided nearly verbatim with the quotation preserved in Timothy's Letter 43. Thanks to this description, it became possible for the present author to establish the connection between the two texts¹².

1.2 Treatise in Ms. Dayr al-Suryan Syr. 27 (9th cent.)

In 1951, the Coptic scholar Murad Kamil visited the “Monastery of the Syrians” (Dayr al-Suryan) in the Egyptian desert of Scetis, where the abbot showed him the Syriac manuscripts (34 in number) that were still preserved in the monastic library¹³. Kamil briefly studied the contents of the codices and described the results of his analysis in Arabic, in a hand-written catalogue, which remained unpublished. Around 1960, Kamil's text was translated into English by Piet B. Dirksen, whose work was also never published¹⁴. The codex containing *PM* was listed under number 29 in this catalogue and, according to Kamil, it combined two different manuscripts, which he dated to the seventh and the tenth centuries respectively.

The first published description of the codex containing *PM* appeared in 2014 in the afore-mentioned catalogue of Brock and Van Rompay, where ms. 29 of Kamil received the shelf-mark 27 (hereafter: ms. DS 27)¹⁵. Similar to Kamil, Lucas Van Rompay, who was mainly responsible for the description of ms. DS 27, distinguished two large parts in it, which he marked as A and B. Part A covers folios 1–94. It contains poetical works of Ephrem the Syrian, Isaac of Antioch, and Jacob of Sarug, and it may be dated as early as the sixth century. Part B covers the rest of the codex (fols. 95–127) and includes, in turn, remains from several other manuscripts.

Van Rompay identified five different “unrelated” manuscripts that formed Part B¹⁶. However, it is likely that this number should be reduced. There is no doubt that

¹⁰ Cf. Brock, “Two Letters of the Patriarch Timothy”, 243; Berti, *Vita e studi di Timoteo I*, 320; Heimgartner, *Die Briefe 42–58: Übersetzung*, 51, n. 238.

¹¹ Brock & Van Rompay, *Catalogue*.

¹² The identification was suggested for the first time in the Russian publication: Arzhanov, “Syriac Natural Philosophy”. See also Arzhanov, *Syriac Sayings of Greek Philosophers*, 129–130.

¹³ Brock & Van Rompay, *Catalogue*, xviii.

¹⁴ Kamil, *Catalogue*.

¹⁵ Brock & Van Rompay, *Catalogue*, 159–177.

¹⁶ Brock & Van Rompay, *Catalogue*, 164–177.

the last folios of DS 27, i.e. fols. 124–127 (= “[Ms. 5]” of Van Rompay¹⁷) originate from a separate codex that is, like the rest of Part B, dated to the ninth/tenth century. These folios are written in one column in the traditional Estrangela script and thus clearly differ from the ductus and from the layout of the rest of Part B.

Two folios, i.e. fols. 96–97 (= “[Ms. 2]” of Van Rompay) are characterized by some unique elements¹⁸ that differentiate them from the ductus of fols. 95 + 98–123. However, they share the same layout of the pages as the latter and are dated to the ninth century. The differences between fols. 96–97 on the one hand, and fols. 95 + 98–123 on the other, may be explained by the assumption that different scribes worked on the same codex, which would reduce the number of manuscripts in Part B to two, though this question demands further clarification.

What seems to be much more certain is the relation between the rest of the folios in Part B. Van Rompay identified three different codices there (= “[Ms. 1]”, “[Ms. 3]”, and “[Ms. 4]”). The text of *PM* gives good reasons for revising this identification. The first mention of the treatise, which in Syriac starts with the words: “Among those who did research on natural principles...” (cf. the description by Timothy I above) appears on folio 100r, which Van Rompay considered part of “[Ms. 4]”. At the end of the fragment of an unidentified text, there stands a short note: “After this — ‘On those who did research on natural principles...’.” This note is elliptical and it may be understood as: “After this, follows...” However, the next piece in the manuscript is not the above-mentioned treatise, but the epistle of Severus Sebokht to Yonan concerning questions of Aristotelian logic. The text of *PM* begins on fol. 114v, which Van Rompay ascribes to “[Ms. 1]”. Folios 98–99, which Van Rompay identified as a separate work (“Explanation of Plato’s thoughts on matter”) and as part of another codex, “[Ms. 3]”, in reality contain the last portion of *PM*.

Thus, “[Ms. 1]”, “[Ms. 3]”, and “[Ms. 4]”, as identified by Van Rompay turn out to be connected through the treatise *On Principles and Matter*, which is scattered through different parts of ms. DS 27. The dating, layout, and the ductus of the three allegedly separate manuscripts also speak in favor of their interrelation:

- All three parts are dated by Van Rompay to the ninth/tenth centuries.
- Their layout is nearly identical: the area of writing is 18/19 × 12/12.5 cm, written in two columns, with 32 to 40 lines per column (this number varies throughout the ms.).
- The form of writing is very similar. It combines elements of Estrangela (e.g., in the letters *Beth*, *Gamal*, *Mim*, *Qaph*, and *Shin*) and Serto (e.g., in the letters *Alaph*, *Dalath*, *He*, *Rish*, and *Taw*).

17 Cf. the table in Brock & Van Rompay, *Catalogue*, 177.

18 Cf. Brock & Van Rompay, *Catalogue*, 166.

k fols. 123r–v

A collection of texts, bearing the title *On Virtue According to the Philosophers and on the Definition of Names* and including a selection from *Sayings of Greek Philosophers*³¹ and *Pythagorean Sentences*³²

The compendium that is reconstructed in the proposed form begins with questions on Aristotelian logic (items *a* and *b*, see also *c* and *h*), includes some works on grammar (items *e* and *g*), and a treatise on natural philosophy (*f*). These works appear side by side with various pieces that may be characterized as “popular philosophy” (*d* and *i*), or moral philosophy in the gnomic form (*j* and *k*), which mostly appear at the end of the compendium. Such a combination of logic, grammar, physics, and moral philosophy is characteristic of another large philosophical anthology, ms. BL Add. 14658, dating from the seventh century, which until the beginning of the 19th century had also been preserved in the library of Dayr al-Suryan³³.

The treatise *On Principles and Matter* occupies a central position in this compendium. Now, various portions of it are disseminated through Part B of ms. DS 27. The correct order of folios is: 114v; 104r–105v; 115r–116v; 98r–99v.

Both the beginning of the treatise (on fol. 114v) and its end (on fol. 99v) have been preserved in the codex. The description of Timothy I (see above) and the reference to the treatise on fol. 100r corroborate the assumption that the Syriac version of the treatise (already at the end of the eighth century, when Timothy was looking for it) contained no specific title, but was referred to by its first sentence.

The references by Timothy (ܐܠܗܐ ܕܥܡܡܐ ܕܥܡܡܐ — “On natural principles of bodies”) and the reference on fol. 100r of the codex (ܐܠܗܐ ܕܥܡܡܐ ܕܥܡܡܐ — “On those who did research on natural principles”) in various ways make use of the first sentence of the treatise, which runs as follows: ܐܠܗܐ ܕܥܡܡܐ ܕܥܡܡܐ ܕܥܡܡܐ ܕܥܡܡܐ ܕܥܡܡܐ ܕܥܡܡܐ — “Among those who did research on natural principles, some said that the first principle is one, and some said that the principles of natural things are many”. While the Catholicos picks up the last words of this sentence, the scribe of the codex quotes its beginning. At present, it is difficult to say whether, originally, the Syriac version of the treatise started with these words and lacked any formal introduction, or whether some part of the treatise had been lost before Timothy came across it at the end of the eighth century.

³¹ Cf. Arzhanov, *Syriac Sayings of Greek Philosophers*, 34–37.

³² For various collections of this gnomic anthology, see Arzhanov, *Syriac Sayings of Greek Philosophers*, 84–90.

³³ For the content of this ms. and the idea of the *enkyklios paideia* reflected in it, see part 1.4 of the Introduction.

In the restored form, the treatise runs without breaks, so that no lacunas can be detected between the preserved folios. Thus, we can assume that ms. DS 27 contains the treatise in a very similar form, as it became known to Timothy, although the codex of Dayr al-Suryan contains no division into parts and chapters, which Timothy anticipates in his description.

The East Syrian Catholicos made clear that the treatise had no formal conclusion. This is also the case with the version of ms. DS 27 which ends with a quotation from Boethius. This quotation runs until the end of the second column of fol. 99v, and after it we find a blank space that could be filled with ca. two lines of text (if we compare this column with the first one on the same page). A graphic sign ✧ marks the end of the treatise, confirming the assumption that no part of the text has been lost due to the loss of folios in ms. DS 27.

The structure of the treatise preserved in the codex of Dayr al-Suryan is also confirmed by the 13th-century witness of Grigorios Bar 'Ebraya, or Barhebraeus, who preserved an abridged version of it.

1.3 Epitome by Barhebraeus (d. 1286)

The Syrian Orthodox Maphrian and polymath, one of the main figures of the so-called “Syriac Renaissance” of the 12th–13th centuries, Grigorios Abu l-Faraġ Bar 'Ebraya, or Barhebraeus, was born in 1225/1226 in Melitene³⁴. He studied in Antioch, Tripoli, and possibly in Damascus, before entering the office of bishop and later on, in 1264, that of the “Maphrian of the East”, the second highest office of the Syrian Orthodox Church, which he held until his death in 1286. His regular place of residence as Maphrian was the monastery of Mar Mattai near Mosul. Thus, Barhebraeus had constant access to the convent’s library, which served as a rich source of material for his works. Additionally, he often resided in Maragha, which at that time became the usual residence of Ilkhans and a new center of learning. Maragha was the place where Barhebraeus met leading Muslim scholars of his day, among others Naṣir al-Din al-Ṭusi, whose works made a great impact on him³⁵.

Barhebraeus left an enormous corpus of writings, which to a large extent have the form of compendia and encyclopedias. Their contents vary from issues of theology to meteorology and natural sciences. The Syrian Orthodox Maphrian draw on a large variety of sources, both Syriac and Arabic, compiling them in such a way that

³⁴ For Barhebraeus, his life and works, see Takahashi, *Barhebraeus: A Bio-Bibliography*.

³⁵ Cf. Borbone, “*Marāgha Mdittā Arškitā*”.

allowed him to create his own, quite original, works³⁶. Some of his sources provided him with the literary forms that he was eager to fill with new materials³⁷.

The *Candelabra of Sanctuary* (*Mnarat Qudshe*) is a compendium of mainly theological contents³⁸. Its title refers to the image of a candelabra with twelve bases for candles, and each part, or *Base*, focuses on a particular branch of knowledge. The second *Base*, which deals with the structure of the universe, was the earliest part of this huge compendium³⁹. Barhebraeus composed it in 1266/1267 after a long stay in the monastery of Mar Mattai⁴⁰. During his work, the Maphrian was thus able to make use of the monastery's rich library, which at that time must still have contained the *PM*, which Timothy I had been searching for there several centuries before.

The second *Base* bears the title ܐܠܗܝܬܐ ܕܡܕܢܚܐ — “On the Nature of the Universe”⁴¹. It contains an excursus on Greek natural philosophy, which turns out to be an abridged version of the treatise that came down to us in ms. DS 27. It starts with an introductory sentence on the diversity of opinions among ancient philosophers concerning the nature of the universe, which has no parallel in the version of ms. DS 27 and was probably introduced by Barhebraeus for the sake of coherence. In the next sentence, he turns to the views of Thales (cf. *PM* §5) and other Greek philosophers. The version of Barhebraeus contains the following three parts:

1. Classification of the views of ancient philosophers on First Principles. The list includes: Thales, Anaximenes, Diogenes, Hippasus, Heraclitus, Theophrastus, Xenophanes, Parmenides, Melissus, Anaxagoras, Leucippus, Democritus, Epicurus, Empedocles, Aristotle, the Stoics, and Pythagoras.
2. An exposition of Plato's thought on First Principles based on the interpretation of the *Timaeus* by Atticus, Severus, Plutarch, and Boethus.
3. A short reference to the teachings of Bardaišan and Mani on First Principles.

The third part of Barhebraeus' account finds no parallels in the version of ms. DS 27. There, the Syrian Orthodox Maphrian refers to two main local “heresies”, which all Syriac authors, starting from Ephrem the Syrian, were eager to refute⁴². However, the

³⁶ Cf. Takahashi, *Aristotelian Meteorology in Syriac*, 3–4.

³⁷ Cf. the analysis of the sources of several parts of the second *Base* of the *Candelabra of Sanctuary* in Takahashi, “The Greco-Syriac and Arabic Sources of Barhebraeus' Mineralogy and Meteorology”.

³⁸ See Takahashi, *Barhebraeus: A Bio-Bibliography*, 175–190.

³⁹ This part of Barhebraeus' work was published several times. Based on ms. Berlin Syr. 190 (Sachau 81): Gottheil, “A Synopsis of Greek Philosophy”. On the basis of mss. Vat. Syr. 168, Berlin Syr. 190 (Sachau 81), and Paris Syr. 210: Bakoš, *Le candélabre du sanctuaire*. Based on ms. Jerusalem, St. Mark's Monastery, Syr. 135: Çiçek, *Mnorath Kudshe*.

⁴⁰ For the date of the composition of the second *Base* of the *Candelabra*, see Takahashi, *Bio-Bibliography*, 23, 91.

⁴¹ See Bakoš, *Le candélabre du sanctuaire*, 542.2 = Çiçek, *Mnorath Kudshe*, 46.2 = Gottheil, “A Synopsis of Greek Philosophy”, 249, line 1 of the Syriac text.

⁴² For Bardaišan and Ephrem, see section 1.4 of the Introduction.

two other parts of Barhebraeus' epitome match the opening and the closing sections of the treatise in ms. DS 27, thus confirming the volume of the treatise in the form preserved in the codex of Dayr al-Suryan, i.e. without any additions at the beginning and at the end.

In spite of differences between the versions of Barhebraeus and ms. DS 27, they clearly go back to the same version of the text, as a comparison of the two passages below demonstrate:

PM §§11–12

۱. مقدمه و هدف از تحقیق در موضوع است
 ۲. روش تحقیق است که در این تحقیق است
 ۳. نتایج تحقیق است که در این تحقیق است
 ۴. نتایج تحقیق است که در این تحقیق است
 ۵. نتایج تحقیق است که در این تحقیق است
 ۶. نتایج تحقیق است که در این تحقیق است
 ۷. نتایج تحقیق است که در این تحقیق است
 ۸. نتایج تحقیق است که در این تحقیق است
 ۹. نتایج تحقیق است که در این تحقیق است
 ۱۰. نتایج تحقیق است که در این تحقیق است

Leucippus, too, says that principles are infinite and that they have change and continuous generation. Further, he said that something that exists is not more than something that does not exist. This was supported by Democritus. He, too, said that principles are infinite, declaring that they are one in genus but different in shapes, species, or in opposition.

Barhebraeus⁴³[illegible]

Leucippus also assumed that principles are infinite, though they have change and continuous generation, and that something that exists is not more than something that does not exist. Further, Democritus said that principles are infinite, have spherical shape, and that they can be divided only in thought, but not in actuality.

43 Bakoš, *Le candélabre du sanctuaire*, 544.5–9 = Çiçek, *Mnorath Kudshe*, 47.9–19 = Gottheil, “A Synopsis of Greek Philosophy”, 250.15–20.

*Placita Philosophorum*⁴⁵. While using the text of *PM*, Barhebraeus was mainly interested in its doxographical parts containing the views of ancient philosophers on First Principles. That was probably the reason he picked fragments from the treatise mainly from the first and from the last part of it, i.e. from the doxography regarding the ancient philosophers and from the discussion of the Platonic interpretation of Matter which included the views of the Middle Platonists Atticus, Severus, Plutarch and others (see *PM* §§1–16 and §§68–97). To this list of the views of Greek philosophers, Barhebraeus finally added two main “Syriac philosophers”, Bardaiṣan and Mani.

Another argument corroborates the assumption that Barhebraeus was acquainted with the ms. that served as the direct source for ms. DS 27. Part B of the latter contains a collection of “Prophecies of Pagan Philosophers about Christ”⁴⁶. This florilegium has been preserved in Syriac in various forms, one of which is represented by mss. DS 27 and SMMJ 124⁴⁷. The “Prophecies” appear also in the *Candelabra of Sanctuary* of Barhebraeus, i.e. in the same work that contains the abridged version of *PM*⁴⁸. One characteristic relates the text of ms. DS 27 closely to Barhebraeus: after the “Prophecies”, DS 27 has preserved for us a note of the translator of the Greek text of the “Prophecies” into Syriac, who complained that there was one more prophecy which he was unable to translate, “because it was similar to the speech of Homer”⁴⁹. The same remark on the missing prophecy that was “similar to the speech of Homer” appears in Barhebraeus, which makes it very probable that the Syrian Orthodox Maphrian was acquainted with the same codex that had served as source for Part B of ms. DS 27 in the late ninth century.

1.4 Natural Philosophy in Syriac Schools

The Syriac version of the treatise *On Principles and Matter* serves as an important witness to the study of Greek science and philosophy in Syriac schools in the pre- and early Islamic periods. Its translation into Syriac forms part of the process of reception

⁴⁵ Hans Daiber pointed out to a number of parallels between Barhebraeus and the Arabic Ps.-Plutarch (Aetius): Daiber, *Aetius Arabus*, 338, 358, 359.

⁴⁶ See the structure of the ms. in 1.2, above.

⁴⁷ See Arzhanov, *Syriac Sayings of Greek Philosophers*, 103–110.

⁴⁸ The *Prophecies* appear in two parts of the work, *Base 3* (Graffin, *Le Candélabre du Sanctuaire*, 582–584) and *Base 4* (Khoury, *Le Candélabre du Sanctuaire*, 18–21).

⁴⁹ The full text of the translator’s note: “These testimonies and oracles were collected from the book of the Pope Anastasius, patriarch of Alexandria. They were translated from Greek into Syriac by the humble Nona, in accordance with my ability, for the praise of God and for the benefit of those who come across them. They are eleven in number. There was one more, but because it was similar to the speech of Homer, I was not able to translate it properly” (see Arzhanov, *Syriac Sayings of Greek Philosophers*, 106).

of Greek natural philosophy by Syrian Christian intellectuals⁵⁰. It seems important to dwell for a short time on this process before we turn to the question of the probable historical background of the Syriac translation of the treatise.

We may differentiate three large periods in the development of the Syriac philosophical tradition⁵¹:

- (1) The early stage between ca. the third and fifth centuries AD, which may to some extent be characterised as authentically Syriac;
- (2) The time between the sixth and ninth centuries AD, when Syriac philosophy comes to be largely dependent on the Alexandrian tradition and can therefore be called Graeco-Syriac;
- (3) The period after the ninth century, which may be called Syro-Arabic⁵².

The formative period of Syriac philosophy does not look like a homogeneous tradition, but appears to modern scholars in a plurality of various forms. It includes such indigenous writers as Aphrahat (first half of the fourth century), and Ephrem the Syrian (d. 373), who seem to have remained uninfluenced by Greek philosophy and thus appear as “essentially Semitic” thinkers⁵³. On the other hand, it includes the figure of Bardaisan (d. 222), who was greatly dependent on Hellenic culture⁵⁴. Also, Ephrem’s knowledge of and references to Greek ideas⁵⁵ were to a large extent due to the need for polemic against influential intellectual groups of his time, like the followers of Bardaisan.

The latter figure stands out in this period, as the influence of his ideas reached even to the time of Barhebraeus (cf. above). Virtually none of Bardaisan’s writings has survived until today; however, the preserved *Book of the Laws of the Countries* composed by his pupil Philip, and references to Bardaisan’s views by Eusebius of

⁵⁰ For the Syriac reception of Greek natural philosophy, see Arzhanov & Arnzen, “Die Glossen in Ms. Leyden Or. 583”.

⁵¹ For general overviews of Syriac philosophy, or philosophy in Syriac, see Endress, “Philosophie und Wissenschaften bei den Syrern”; Daiber, “Die syrische Tradition in frühislamischer Zeit”; Hugonnard-Roche & Watt, “Philosophie im syrischen Sprachbereich”; Watt, “Syriac Philosophy”; Fiori & Hugonnard-Roche, *La philosophie en syriaque*.

⁵² This classification differs from the one proposed by Sebastian Brock, who suggested the following periodisation of the process of creative adaptation of Hellenic culture, or the “Hellenization of Syriac culture”: (1) the fourth century, when “Syriac culture is still essentially Semitic in its outlook”, (2) the fifth and sixth centuries that form a period of transition, and (3) the period after the seventh century (Brock, “From Antagonism to Assimilation”).

⁵³ The expression of S. Brock, see Brock, “From Antagonism to Assimilation”, 17.

⁵⁴ Cf. Furlani, “Sur le stoïcisme de Bardesane d’Édesse”; Beck, “Ephräms Rede gegen eine philosophische Schrift des Bardaisan”; Possekel, “Bardaisan of Edessa: Philosopher or Theologian?”; Ramelli, *Bardaisan of Edessa: A Reassessment*.

⁵⁵ Cf. Possekel, *Evidence of Greek Philosophical Concepts*.

lived in Edessa at the beginning of the third and in the second half of the fourth century respectively, meant by the “house of Plato”.

The latter expression was used by a later monastic author, John the Solitary, in the first half of the fifth century⁶⁵. His monastery was located in close proximity to Apamea on the Orontes, which became famous for its philosophical school founded by Iamblichus⁶⁶. In the second half of the second century, it became the place of living and teaching for Numenius. In 269, Plotinus’ disciple Amelius settled himself there in order to write down the notes he had made of his teacher’s lectures. Thus, by the fifth century, Apamea had become an important center of Neo-Platonism, and it is probably this “house of Plato” to which John referred in his letters⁶⁷.

By the fifth century, the general negative attitude of Christian intellectuals towards non-Christian (“pagan”) philosophical schools (present in the writings of John the Solitary) became especially apparent. As a consequence of this process, the Platonic philosophy that had worked its way into the Syriac philosophical tradition of the third to the fifth centuries became unattractive to Syriac intellectuals. However, another form of it replaced the academic (Neo-)Platonism of such centers as Apamea, namely the monastic ascetic teachings that were based to a large extent on the ideas of Origen. The works of Evagrius Ponticus contributed much to the reception and adaptation of Origenistic ideas in monastic circles⁶⁸. Nearly the whole corpus of Evagrius’ writings was translated into Syriac, and his concept of natural philosophy, whose aim he saw as the revelation of the truth hidden in the world,⁶⁹ made a great impact on natural philosophy in Syriac schools in the later period.

The knowledge of Greek natural philosophy in Syriac schools also included various forms of doxography, which transmitted for Syriac scholars the views of Greek philosophical schools. The use of doxographical materials was to a large extent dependent on the new models of education, which, since the fourth century, were primarily connected with monasteries⁷⁰. The Syriac ms. BL Add. 14620 has preserved a list of ancient Greek philosophers and sages, which suggests some kind of overview

65 For John the Solitary and his identity, see Hausherr, “Un grand auteur”; Strothmann, *Johannes von Apamea*.

66 Cf. Balty, “Apamea in Syria”.

67 Cf. Strothmann, *Johannes von Apamea*, 8 (Syriac), 120 (German).

68 Cf. Arzhanov, “Plato in Syriac Literature”, 17–19.

69 Cf. the last part (that has been preserved only in Syriac) of the treatise *Gnostikos*: ܡܬܟܠܝܢ ܕܥܡܪܝܢܐ — “The aim of physical knowledge (= φυσική) is to reveal the truth hidden in things” (Frankenberg, *Evagrius Ponticus*, 552–553). For the preserved Greek text of the treatise, see Guillaumont & Guillaumont, *Le gnostique*.

70 See Arzhanov, “Greek Philosophers in Monastic Schools”. An interesting example of the Oriental reception of the tradition of *Placita Philosophorum* is found in the story of Secundus Taciturnus. Especially the Arabic translation of *Vita Secundi* stands under the sign of the *Placita*, cf. Overwien, “Secundus der schweigende Philosoph”.

of Greek philosophy and which transmits for us the picture of classical Greek antiquity as taught in late antique and early medieval Syriac schools⁷¹. This list contains not only such famous philosophers as Aristotle, Plato and the Seven Sages, but also Zeus, Minus and Rhadamanthus. The latter figures derive from the Greek mythology known to Syriac readers mainly due to the corpus of scholia to the writings of Gregory of Nazianzus attributed to a certain Nonnus⁷².

The scholia to the orations of Gregory turned into a rich source of knowledge of the history of Greek philosophy, containing summaries of the Platonic dialogues and rudimentary information on Greek philosophers. Among the scholia, we find the following one⁷³:

Thirty-seventh is the story about the dejection of Heraclitus. It is this. Although Heraclitus and Democritus did not live at the same time, they were natural philosophers who mocked alike at the constant changes of the world, the latter by laughing and the former by weeping. For Democritus laughed continuously at human affairs, while Heraclitus wept. Democritus was an Abderitan, and Heraclitus an Ephesian.

With his writings, Gregory of Nazianzus set up the way for the rejection of the Greek non-Christian school system of the fifth century and for the new Christian system of education which was later adopted by Syriac intellectuals. This transformation marks the transition to a new period of Syriac philosophy, which is dominated by Aristotelian writings and stands under the sign of the Alexandrian tradition.

It starts with the figure of Sergius of Resh'ayna (*Sargis d-Resh'ayna*, d. 536)⁷⁴. In the late fifth century, Sergius spent several years in Alexandria, where he received a philosophical education from Ammonius, son of Hermeias, accompanied by a

⁷¹ See Arzhanov, *Syriac Sayings of Greek Philosophers*, 131–133.

⁷² They were translated twice into Syriac, see Brock, *The Syriac Version of the Pseudo-Nonnos Mythological Scholia*. Edition of the Greek corpus: Nimmo Smith, *Pseudo-Nonniani in IV Orationes Gregorii Nazianzeni Commentarii*. English translation: Nimmo Smith, *The Christian's Guide to Greek Culture*.

⁷³ Scholion 4.37: Τριακοστή ἑβδόμη ἐστὶν ἱστορία ἢ κατὰ τὴν Ἡρακλείτου κατῆφειαν. ἔστι δὲ αὕτη. Ἡράκλειτος καὶ Δημόκριτος οὐκ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ γεγονότες χρόνῳ, φυσικοὶ δὲ ὄντες, ὁμοίως τὴν τοῦ κόσμου ἀλλεπαλληλίαν διέπαιζαν, ὁ μὲν γελῶν, ὁ δὲ κλαίων. ὁ μὲν Δημόκριτος ἐγέλα συνεχῶς τὰ πράγματα, ὁ δὲ Ἡράκλειτος ἔκλαιεν. ἦν δὲ ὁ μὲν Δημόκριτος Ἀβδηρίτης, ὁ δὲ Ἡράκλειτος Ἐφέσιος. (Nimmo Smith, *Pseudo-Nonniani in IV Orationes*, 103). The English translation is adapted from Nimmo Smith, *The Christian's Guide*, 27. For the Syriac version of the scholion, see Brock, *The Syriac Version of the Pseudo-Nonnos Mythological Scholia*, 99 (English), 231 (Syriac).

⁷⁴ For Sergius, see Hugonnard-Roche, “Aux origines de l'exégèse orientale et la logique d'Aristote”; Hugonnard-Roche, “Note sur Sergius de Rēš'ainā”; Fiori, “Un intellectuel alexandrin en Mésopotamie”; Aydin, *Sergius of Reshaina*, 3–66.

Those who in wisdom speak about wisdom say that, firstly, philosophy is divided into two parts, i.e. into theory and practice. Further, theory, in turn, is divided into theology, into knowledge of natural things, and into mathematical sciences, i.e. into geometry, arithmetic, astronomy, and music.

The same outline of the educational system that includes “knowledge of natural things” (ܟܠܠܬܗ ܚܝܬܐ), i.e. physics, appears in the later Syriac philosophical compendia and schoolbooks⁸². Thus, from the time of Sergius, i.e. from the beginning of the sixth century, the Syriac pedagogical system includes the notion of physics as part of the “theoretical” sciences.

Further evidence corroborates the assumption that Syrians were not only familiar with the notion of Greek *paideia*, but adopted and integrated it into their own pedagogical system. Familiarity with the Greek system of education is apparent in the structure of the Syriac ms. BL Add. 14658, dated to the seventh century⁸³. It starts with the afore-mentioned introduction in Aristotle’s *Categories* written by Sergius and contains Porphyry’s *Isagoge* and the text of *Categories*⁸⁴, as well as some treatises on grammar. Another group of texts in the codex is focussed on questions of physics and astronomy, while the rest of it contains various treatises on moral philosophy, some of which have come down as pseudepigraphic works ascribed to Plato⁸⁵.

Two texts appear as representatives of natural philosophy in this collection, and both of them are ascribed to Aristotle. The first one is the Syriac version of the pseud-epigraphical letter *De Mundo* (Περὶ κόσμου πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον)⁸⁶. This work was probably composed in the first century BC and thus belongs to the Middle Platonic period⁸⁷. The second treatise that appears in the “physical” part of the BL codex bears the title: “A Memra on the Cause of the Universe Written by Sergius, a Priest from

⁸² The whole passage from Sergius’ treatise is repeated verbatim by Paul the Persian (531–578), see Gutas, “Paul the Persian”. A similar one appears in the *Book of Scholia* of Theodore Bar Koni (late 8th century): Hespel, *Théodore bar Koni, Livre des scolies (recension d’Urmiah)*, 45–46.

⁸³ Cf. Wright, *Catalogue*, vol. 3, 1154–1160. The analysis of the content of this codex: Hugonnard-Roche, “Le corpus philosophique syriaque”; King, “Origenism in Sixth Century Syria”.

⁸⁴ Brock, “The Earliest Syriac Translation of Porphyry’s *Eisagoge*”; King, *The Earliest Syriac Translation of Aristotle’s Categories*.

⁸⁵ Thus, the structure of this codex suggests the way from a *prolegomena*-text to what were considered to be works of Plato, the way characteristic of the pedagogical model of Alexandria, cf. Watts, *City and School*.

⁸⁶ Edition of the Syriac text: de Lagarde, *Analecta Syriaca*, 134–158. Cf. Ryssel, *Über den textkritischen Werth*, Teil 1; McCollum, *A Greek and Syriac Index*; Takahashi, “Syriac and Arabic Transmission of *On the Cosmos*”.

⁸⁷ For an overview of the scholarly evaluation of *De Mundo*, see Thom, “Introduction”; Gregorić & Karamanolis, *Pseude-Aristotle: De Mundo*.

seems to be found without shape and figure. Consequently, it first receives a certain extension toward length, breadth, and depth, in order to grow, and when it has attained to length, breadth, and depth, and these three dimensions have occurred in it, then they (i.e. the philosophers) name it the second nature of the bodies. And afterwards, it is considered to receive figures, qualities and faculties, and it makes up four primary bodies, those which by us in common usage are named elements. All bodies that are here are compounded of these (four elements), those (bodies) that undergo generation and corruption. When this Matter, which has acquired magnitude, receives dryness and heat, it becomes fire, when it receives cold and moisture, it produces water, but if it obtains dryness and cold, it forms earth, and if heat and moisture occur in it, it builds air. In this way, those who did research in natural philosophy have tried to speak about matter.

Sergius presents these views as some sort of standard summary of the philosophy of nature. Thus, we may assume that he has learned them during his classes in philosophy in the school of Ammonius Hermeiou in Alexandria. This summary turns out to be very close to *PM*, especially in the following points:

- 1) Matter is the “primary foundation” of bodies, a characteristic which goes back to Plato (cf. *PM* §§41, 69, 70 etc.);
- 2) Matter is “without quality and without figure”, but is receptive to any quality and figure (this idea constitutes a large part of *PM*, cf., e.g., §69);
- 3) The four elements (“four primary bodies”) are not first principles, for they are generated (cf. §35).

If we assume that the author of the lost Greek original of *PM* was Porphyry, then both *PM* and the short *Introduction* of Sergius derive from the same philosophical tradition of natural philosophy, for Ammonius’ teacher Proclus turns out to be familiar with the writings of Porphyry, whom he often quotes in his own commentary on Plato’s *Timaeus*.

Sergius’ summary of natural philosophy in his short *Introduction* quoted above does not go into further differences between the arguments of “those who did research in natural philosophy”. A more extensive overview including excurses into the notions of First Principles by Zeno, Pythagoras, Plato, and Stoics appears in chapters 3 and 4 of Sergius’ long *Commentary* addressed to Theodore⁹⁹.

Other Syriac commentaries on the logical works of Porphyry and Aristotle contain elements of doxography; e.g., a collection of scholia on Aristotle’s *Categories* that is attributed to the Alexandrian philosopher Olympiodorus has been preserved in the

⁹⁹ See Aydin, *Sergius of Reshaina*, 73–74.

ninth century Syriac codex BL Add. 18821¹⁰⁰. It contains an overview of various philosophical schools, including Aristotelians, Platonists, Pythagoreans, Epicureans, and Cyrenaics.

Thus, Syrian scholars were familiar with Greek natural philosophy through the reception of the Alexandrian commentaries on the *Organon* that contained elements of doxography. The logical studies in general form the background of other philosophical and scholarly disciplines, including physics. Syriac manuscripts have preserved for us a number of mostly anonymous treatises that combine questions of natural philosophy with logical categories, probably reflecting the pedagogical practice in Syriac schools in the early medieval period:

- Ms. BL Add. 12155 dated to the seventh/eighth centuries¹⁰¹ contains on fol. 178r a treatise entitled *A Natural Demonstration (composed) by Sergius the Archiatros*¹⁰². This short scholion combines definitions of various logical categories (e.g., substance, accident, species, etc.) with terms that derive from natural philosophy (e.g., nature, body, water, etc.). The title of this scholion may be interpreted as an attempt to deal with issues of physics by means of logical definitions, an attempt that most likely reflects the pedagogical practice of the time of the composition of this codex.
- The afore-mentioned scholion finds multiple parallels in the short treatise *On the Division of Substance*¹⁰³, which is found in ms. BL Add. 14658 (fols. 168r–172r)¹⁰⁴. This work contains extracts from Sergius' short *Introduction to Aristotle* addressed to Philotheos¹⁰⁵, and it is possible that it derives from Sergius himself.
- A different version of this collection of logical definitions has been preserved in ms. DS 27 (fols. 107v–113v)¹⁰⁶, where it bears the title *On the Division of Substance, On the Division of Creatures, and On the Mixtures of a Body*¹⁰⁷. The last part of this title makes clear that physical issues form a considerable portion of this collection. After the initial definitions of the term “substance”, it contains a survey of the four elements that constitute physical bodies. The differences between this version of the collection of definitions and the one preserved in the BL ms. may

¹⁰⁰ See Furlani, “Pseudo-Olimpodoro”.

¹⁰¹ Wright, *Catalogue*, vol. 2, 921–955.

¹⁰² Syr.: ܣܪܓܝܘܣ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ. Unpublished. An Italian translation: Furlani, “Due scoli filosofici”. Furlani considered the ascription of this work to Sergius to be false. However, H. Hugonnard-Roche revised Furlani's arguments and concluded that there were good reasons to take this ascription seriously: Hugonnard-Roche, *La logique d'Aristote du grec au syriaque*, 129. Sami Aydin comes to the similar conclusion: Aydin, *Sergius of Reshaina*, 13.

¹⁰³ Syriac: ܣܪܓܝܘܣ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ. Unpublished.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Wright, *Catalogue*, vol. 3, 1154–1160.

¹⁰⁵ Sami Aydin lists the parallels between two treatises: Aydin, *Sergius of Reshaina*, 12.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Brock & Van Rompay, *Catalogue*, 171–172.

¹⁰⁷ Syriac: ܣܪܓܝܘܣ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ. Unpublished.

1.5 Time and Background of the Syriac Translation

The testimony of Timothy I coming from late 781 or early 782 serves as a *terminus ante quem* for the Syriac version of the treatise *On Principles and Matter*. Thus, the translation belongs to the second period of Syriac philosophy, which is dominated by the Alexandrian philosophical tradition. What makes *PM* rather unique for this period is its focus on Platonic ideas, for, as the previous section makes apparent, Syriac philosophy between the sixth and the ninth century was predominantly Aristotelian.

The description preserved in Timothy's letter informs us that the history of *PM* was connected with the monastery Mar Mattai, which turned into one of the main intellectual centers of the West Syrian (or "Syrian Orthodox") Church and from the ninth century AD into the seat of West Syrian Maphrians. Thus, the origins of the Syriac translation of the treatise turn out to be closely connected to the history of the Syrian Orthodox Church, which from the time of its foundation expressed great interest in translations from the Greek¹¹⁶.

Severus (456–538), who in 512–518 held the position of patriarch of Antioch, became one of the leading figures in the formation of the West Syrian tradition¹¹⁷. In the late fifth century, Severus received rhetorical education in Alexandria, where he came in touch with the so-called *philoponoï*, groups of Christian laymen who played an important role in the conflict between the Christian Church and the local Egyptian culture¹¹⁸. As patriarch of Antioch, Severus applied the polemic strategies of the Alexandrian *philoponoï* not only against the local “pagan” culture, but also against the Chalcedonians, i.e. the Byzantine Church that supported the dogmatic formula accepted at the Council of Chalcedon in 451.

The Syrian Orthodox Church further developed the intellectual program of Severus of Antioch based on the ideas of the *philoponoi* and actively applied the latter name to the West Syrian intellectuals¹¹⁹. In his preface to the Syriac translation of ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite, which dates to the beginning of the ninth century¹²⁰, Phocas bar Sargis¹²¹ compared the translation activity of Sergius of Resh'aina with that of the later generations of West Syrian scholars as follows¹²²:

116 Cf. Tannous, “You are what you read”; Tannous, *The Making of the Medieval Middle East*.

¹¹⁷ Cf. Grillmeier & Hainthaler, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. II/2, 21–175; Allen & Hayward, *Severus of Antioch*.

118 Cf. Watts, *City and School*, 213–219.

119 Cf. Arzhanov, *Syriac Sayings of Greek Philosophers*, 152–156.

120 Preserved in ms. BL Add. 12151 (dated to the year 804), see Wright, *Catalogue*, vol. 2, 493–497.

¹²¹ On Phocas bar Sargis, see Baumstark, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur*, 271–272.

[illegible]

At that age (i.e. in the time of Sergius of Resh'aina), it was not yet customary that many people had been trained in the art of interpreting the Greek language, until the time was ripe and after several generations it brought forth other “lovers of labour” (Syr. ܐܝܬܐܢܐ ܕܠܒܐܢܐ = Gr. φιλόπονοι), like the holy and blessed Athanasius, Patriarch of Antioch, and Jacob, bishop of Edessa, who paved this way as much as possible through their abilities, having become married to both languages in some manner.

The Syriac *philoponoi* mentioned in this note, Athanasius II of Balad and Jacob of Edessa, who are praised as skilled translators from Greek into Syriac, were connected with the monastery of Qenneshre. Founded in ca. 530 by John bar Aphtonias on the Eastern bank of the Euphrates, this convent became the alma mater for a large number of scholars who were well trained in Greek philosophical literature¹²³. This group included Thomas of Harkel, Paul of Edessa, Severus Sebokht, Jacob of Edessa, and others, who produced a large corpus of new translations from the Greek as well as revised editions of the earlier translations¹²⁴. This corpus included both Aristotle's *Organon* (including Porphyry's *Isagoge*) and the writings of the Church Fathers, e.g. Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Severus of Antioch¹²⁵.

The pedagogical activity of Severus Sebokht (d. 666/667) marked a new period of scholarly life at Qenneshre¹²⁶. Severus Sebokht became the teacher of two renowned specialists in Greek, Athanasius of Balad (d. 687) and Jacob of Edessa (d. 708), whose friend and colleague George of the Arabs (d. 724) was also influenced by Severus' scholarly work¹²⁷. Like most of his colleagues at Qenneshre, Severus Sebokht was well trained in Aristotelian logic, various questions of which he discussed in two of his extant letters written to his fellow-priests, Yonan¹²⁸ and Aitallaha¹²⁹. Additionally, he

ܐܝܬܐܢܐ ܕܠܒܐܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܐܬܢܐܨܝܢܐ (Wright, *Catalogue*, vol. 2, 494; cf. Wiessner, “Zur Handschriftenüberlieferung”, 198).

123 Cf. Watt, “A Portrait of John Bar Aphtonias”.

124 For the history of Qenneshre, see Tannous, *The Making of the Medieval Middle East*, 169–176; Hugonnard-Roche, “Die Schule von Keneschre”.

125 Cf. Tannous, *The Making of the Medieval Middle East*, 189–192.

126 See Reinink, “Severos Sebokht”.

127 Cf. Villey, “Quadrivium dans la tradition syriaque”.

128 The letter was first described and summarized in Reinink, “Severus Sebokht's Brief” (Reinink used ms. BL Add. 17156). The full text of the letter was published in Hugonnard-Roche, “Questions de logique au VII^e siècle” (ed. based on mss. BL Add. 17156, Berlin Petermann I 9, Cambridge Add. 2812, and Baghdad, Chaldean Monastery 171).

129 Hugonnard-Roche, “L'épître de Sévère Sebokht à Aitallaha”.

century onward, rather than the earlier period¹⁴⁰. In order to date the Syriac version of *PM* more precisely, we have to compare its terminology with the early sixth century versions of the Greek texts, on the one hand, and with the versions produced in the seventh/eighth centuries by the Qenneshre scholars, on the other. The following extant Syriac translations from the Greek form the basis of the comparison¹⁴¹:

Early translations

IsagAn — Anonymous translation of Porphyry's *Isagoge* dated to the sixth century.¹⁴²

CatAn — Anonymous translation of Aristotle's *Categories* dated to the first half of the sixth century.¹⁴⁴

DeInAn — Anonymous translation of Aristotle's *De Interpretatione* dated to the second half of the sixth century.¹⁴⁷

DeM — Ps.-Aristotle *De Mundo*, Syriac translation attributed to Sergius of Resh'ayna.¹⁴⁹

Qenneshre translations

IsagAth — Athanasius of Balad's version of Porphyry's *Isagoge*.¹⁴³

CatG — George of the Arab's translation of Aristotle's *Categories*.¹⁴⁵

CatJ — Jacob of Edessa's translation of Aristotle's *Categories*.¹⁴⁶

DeInG — George of the Arab's translation of Aristotle's *De Interpretatione*.¹⁴⁸

There are a number of philosophical terms in the Syriac text of *PM*, which bring it closer to the earlier translations rather than to the philosophical lexicon characteristic of the Qenneshre translation style that is primarily associated with the work of Jacob of Edessa and George of the Arabs. See, for instance, the following terms, which we find in the Syriac version of *PM*:

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Brock, "Towards a History of Syriac Translation Technique"; Brock, "Changing Fashions in Syriac Translation Technique".

¹⁴¹ Most of the following texts were analysed on the basis of their digital editions in the database HUNAYNNET, <<https://hunaynnet.oeaw.ac.at/>>, assessed on 01.10.2020.

¹⁴² Brock, "The Earliest Syriac Translation of Porphyry's *Eisagoge*". See also Brock, "Some Notes on the Syriac Translations of Porphyry's *Eisagoge*".

¹⁴³ Freimann, *Die Isagoge des Porphyrius* (partial edition). For the full text of Athanasius' translation, see HUNAYNNET.

¹⁴⁴ King, *The Earliest Syriac Translation of Aristotle's Categories*. Cf. the edition in HUNAYNNET, which in many aspects differs from King's edition.

¹⁴⁵ Furlani, "Le Categorie e gli Ermeneutici di Aristotele".

¹⁴⁶ Georr, *Les Catégories d'Aristote*.

¹⁴⁷ Hoffmann, *De Hermeneuticis apud Syros Aristoteleis*.

¹⁴⁸ Furlani, "Le Categorie e gli Ermeneutici di Aristotele".

¹⁴⁹ De Lagarde, *Analecta Syriaca*, 134–158; McCollum, *The Syriac De Mundo*.

ܩܝ

IsagAn and *CatAn* use this word as a translation for ποιός. *IsagAth* and *CatJ* consequently use the term ܩܬܬܐ. In his letter to the scribes (see above), Jacob of Edessa makes clear that this was a deliberate change of the terminology accomplished by the Qenneshre scholars, from which the Syriac text of *PM*, however, remains uninfluenced.

ܕܪܫܐܝܢܐ

IsagAn thus translates ἰδίως, which in *IsagAth* is rendered as ܕܪܫܐܝܢܐ. Sergius of Resh'ayna uses this term in his translation of *DeM*.

ܕܠܥܝܢܐ

IsagAn, *CatAn*, and *DeM* thus translate the Greek ἐναντίος. ܕܠܥܝܢܐ does not appear in the Qenneshre translations (*IsagAth*, *CatJ*, and *CatG*)¹⁵⁰ that prefer the adjective ܕܠܥܝܢܐ. Cf. also ܕܠܥܝܢܐ in *CatAn* as a translation of ἐναντιότης, while *CatJ* and *CatG* have ܕܠܥܝܢܐ.

ܕܝܢܐ

IsagAn and *CatAn* thus translate the Greek διαφορά. This word does not appear in the later translations, where it is replaced by ܕܝܢܐ.

ܕܠܥܝܢܐ

This expression appears in *IsagAn* and *DeInAn* as a translation of the Greek ἄλογος, and it seems that it appears in *PM* with the same meaning. However, both *IsagAth* and *DeInG* use another, apparently more precise, expression ܕܠܥܝܢܐ that better renders the Greek adjective.

ܕܝܢܐ and ܕܝܢܐ

Both words appear in *CatAn* and *IsagAn* with the meaning “name” and “category”. Later they were replaced by the terms ܕܝܢܐ and ܕܝܢܐ.

ܕܝܢܐ

The adverbial form ܕܝܢܐ appears in the early translations (*IsagAn*, *CatAn*, and *DeInAn*) in the sense “naturally”¹⁵¹ or as rendering of φύσει. Later translations (*CatJ*, *CatG*, and *AnPrG*) prefer other, more literal, expressions, e.g. ܕܝܢܐ.

The examples listed above may serve as evidence for the early dating of the Syriac version of the treatise. They present the terminology of the treatise as preceding the scholarly activity of Jacob of Edessa and George of the Arabs.

¹⁵⁰ The term ܕܠܥܝܢܐ appears in the last half of *CatJ* and *CatG* (after *Cat.* 11b15) as a translation of τὰ ἀντικείμενα, but this seems to be the influence of *CatAn*, cf. King, *The Earliest Syriac Translation of Aristotle's Categories*, 80–85.

¹⁵¹ Cf. also *CatAn* 136.32 King, where this word is added for expressing the implicit sense.

On the other hand, a number of examples bring the Syriac text of *PM* closer to the Qenneshre translations of Greek works rather than to the versions that appear earlier in the sixth century:

ܐܬܢܐܨܝܐܝܐ

Athanasius of Balad and later Jacob of Edessa (in *IsagAth* and *CatJ*) use this word for the translation of the Greek ἀπόφασις. The earlier translations prefer either to transliterate the Greek term or to use the word ܐܠܦ (as in *IsagAn*).

ܐܡܪܝܐ

This word appears in the Qenneshre translations as rendering of the Greek ἀποδεικτικός, which is usually transliterated in the earlier translations¹⁵².

ܐܡܪܝܐ ܕܐܠܦ

This expression appears in the Qenneshre translations (*IsagAth*, *CatJ*, and *CatG*) as rendering of the Greek ἄτομος¹⁵³. However, the same expression appears also in *CatAn* and thus it predates the Qenneshre period. At the same time, *IsagAn* consistently uses ܐܡܪܝܐ ܕܐܠܦ.

ܕܡܝܐ

IsagAth thus translates the Greek κυρίως, while *IsagAn* renders the latter with ܕܡܝܐܝܐ. *CatAn* translates with ܕܡܝܐ both κυρίως and οἰκείως, while *CatJ* and *CatG* make a clear distinction between the two Greek terms. The same is characteristic of the Syriac text of *PM*, cf. the next example.

ܕܡܝܐ

IsagAth uses this adjective for translation of the Greek οἰκεῖος, while *IsagAn* renders the latter term with ܕܡܝܐܝܐ. *CatJ* and *CatG* also render οἰκεῖος with ܕܡܝܐ, while the variant of *CatAn* is ܕܡܝܐܝܐ.

ܕܡܝܐ

This term rarely appears in the early translations. In *CatAn* and in *DeM* it renders the Greek ἐαυτοῦ, which Jacob of Edessa and George of the Arabs translated with the more traditional ܡܠܐ ܡܢܐ in their versions of the *Categories*. This term, however, appears in the anonymous scholia on *Categories* in ms. Vat. Syr. 586, where it seems to mean “(independent) existence”¹⁵⁴. These scholia are based on Jacob’s translation of the *Categories* and are thus not earlier than the end of the seventh century.

152 Cf. two Syriac versions of *Analytica Priora* 24a10–11 (περὶ ἀπόδειξιν καὶ ἐπιστήμης ἀποδεικτικῆς): ܐܡܪܝܐܝܐ ܕܐܠܦ ܐܡܪܝܐܝܐܝܐ (Proba) and ܐܡܪܝܐܝܐ ܕܐܠܦ ܐܡܪܝܐܝܐܝܐ (George of the Arabs).

153 *CatG* uses the transliterated form ܐܬܡܝܐ on one occasion.

154 Cf. Aydin, “The Remnant of a Questions and Answers Commentary”, 78.29.

Thus, the terminology of the Syriac text of *PM* appears to be very close to the Qenneshre versions of the Greek texts. However, it differs in many ways from the translation style of Jacob of Edessa and George of the Arabs and thus maintains the terminology of the earlier translations made in the sixth century.

Based on Jacob's letter, we can assume that the second half of the seventh century witnessed a considerable reformation of the philosophical and scientific terminology that is mainly associated with the work of Jacob of Edessa and his fellow colleague George of the Arabs, in whose writings we find the new vocabulary. The Syriac version of *PM* pre-dates the terminological reform of Jacob and thus belongs to the period before the second half of the seventh century.

This period of the Qenneshre history is dominated by the scholarly activity of Severus Sebokht, whose interest in natural philosophy appears as the likely reason for producing the Syriac translation of the treatise, which could have been easily integrated into the study of logic. As was noted above, Part B of ms. DS 27 contains not only *PM*, but also a large collection of various definitions, which starts with the terms “substance”, “genus”, and “species”, but later on turns to the topic of the “mixtures of the body”, i.e. to the combination of hotness, coldness, dryness, and wetness. This topic occupies much space in the *PM* (cf. Part 4, especially §§50–55), and we see some similarities between the two works preserved in Syriac. Both of them combine questions of logic and physics (the tract *On the Division of Essence* contains a collection of scholia on Porphyry’s *Isagoge*, cf. above) and probably go back to the pedagogical practice at Qenneshre.

The philosophical compendium, which contains *PM* and which now forms part B of ms. DS 27 thus turns out to be a product of the pedagogical and scholarly activity of Severus Sebokht. In its original form, a reconstruction of which was suggested above (see 1.2), it contained several letters of Severus, in which he mainly addressed questions of logic.

Severus' letter to the periodeutes Yonan includes a passage dealing with natural philosophy. In this passage, Severus answers the question of his respondent as to why Aristotle used letters of the alphabet in his explanations of logical syllogisms. The Syriac scholar suggests three explanations, the first of which runs as follows¹⁵⁵:

[illegible]

Concerning another (question): For what reason (Aristotle) composed the types of the figures and of the syllogisms with the help of the letters of the alphabet?

The first reason is that he was zealous in the four mathematical sciences, I mean arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music, which by means of the letters of the alphabet produce (visual) illustrations of the knowledge that they transmit. They speak not about the physical and material bodies, like natural philosophers, but rather like mathematicians, about number and form, and about their movements and sounds.

Severus' notion of the "natural philosophers" (Syr. ܦܝܠܫܘܦܝܐ ܬܒܝܥܝܬܐ that is a calque from the Greek οἱ φυσικοὶ φιλόσοφοι) is an interesting detail in his argument. This expression usually refers not just to thinkers who wrote on the philosophy of nature, but specifically to the pre-Socratics, who considered the physical elements (e.g., water or fire) to be First Principles¹⁵⁶. Thus, Severus Sebokht demonstrates his knowledge of the doxographical accounts on the pre-Socratics that were important elements of the commentaries on Aristotelian works¹⁵⁷.

On the other hand, Severus' reference to those, who speak "about the physical and material bodies", is most likely not just a figure of speech, because Severus demonstrated solid knowledge in natural sciences, mainly in astronomy. It is also likely that the Greek text of *PM* attracted the attention of the bishop of Qenneshre, who could have been interested in producing its Syriac version for pedagogical purposes.

The attribution of the Syriac translation of *PM* to Severus Sebokht is corroborated by a number of cases where the terminology of Severus' writings turns out to be very close to the terminology of *PM*:

- In his Letter to Yonan, Severus first uses the term ܦܝܠܫܘܦܝܐ, which he explains with an alternative term ܬܒܝܥܝܬܐ that we also find in *PM*¹⁵⁸. It is the latter term which Severus prefers to use in the rest of his letter. We can thus assume that at his time ܦܝܠܫܘܦܝܐ was not self-evident and demanded an explanation. By the time of George of the Arabs, it was already so well-known that no comment was necessary, but this was not yet the case at the time of Severus.
- In the same letter, Severus uses the term ܬܒܝܥܝܬܐ, which is characteristic of the earlier translations (and of *PM*); starting with Athanasius, the Qenneshre scholars preferred to use the adjective ܬܒܝܥܝܬܐ.

¹⁵⁶ Cf. Olympiodorus, *In Arist. Meteor.* II 1 353a32 (126.14 Stüve).

¹⁵⁷ E.g., we find references to "natural philosophers" in Sergius of Resh'ayna's long *Commentary on Categories* addressed to Theodore (cf. above).

¹⁵⁸ Cf. the following passage from Severus' *Letter to Yonan*: ܦܝܠܫܘܦܝܐ ܬܒܝܥܝܬܐ ܬܒܝܥܝܬܐ (Hugonnard-Roche, "Questions de logique au VIIe siècle", 64.9–10).

- In his letter to Aitallaha, Severus terms human abilities, which people possess, **ܕܡܝܬܐ**, “by nature”. Thus, he applies the terminology of the early translations, where his later Qenneshre colleagues would prefer to use the expression **ܡܝܬܐ**.

These examples demonstrate that Severus himself was very probably the translator of the treatise. The time of Severus appears as the transition period when traditional philosophical terminology characteristic of the earlier translations began to be replaced by new terminology characteristic of the Qenneshre translation style. The same combination of earlier terminology and Qenneshre innovations is characteristic of the Syriac text of *PM*.

Severus Sebokht could also have been interested in the Platonic teachings expressed in the treatise. In his letter on the priority of the Syrians in astronomy mentioned above, Severus refers to Plato on one occasion and even quotes a passage from the *Timaeus*¹⁵⁹:

Concerning the rather late knowledge of the Greeks, i.e. concerning their ignorance, we should listen to the Greeks themselves, I mean to Plato, who was the first and most famous philosopher among them. This is what he wrote in the treatise *Timaeus*:

“When Solon, the wisest among the sages, had returned from Egypt, he told Critias what he had heard from an Egyptian priest who was very old. The latter told him the following: ‘Oh, Solon, Solon! You Greeks will always remain children. There is no Greek who is old.’ And later on he said: ‘You Greeks are all young in your minds, for there you have neither any old opinion nor a teaching that would be old in time. Because writing was missing among you for many generations, you were dying voiceless’.”

Severus' knowledge of the most famous Platonic dialogue is second-hand. His account turns out to be a nearly verbatim translation of the periphrasis of the *Timaeus* passage that appears in (Ps.-)Justin Martyr's *Cohortatio ad Graecos*¹⁶⁰. It is not surprising that by the seventh century Syrian intellectuals were mostly familiar with the

[illegible]

160 Ps.-Justin, *Cohortatio ad Graecos*, ch. 12 (39 Markovich).

Christianized image of the Athenian philosopher, which was transmitted to them by the works of the apologists¹⁶¹. Nevertheless, Severus' interest in the ideas of Plato, "the first and most famous philosopher" of the Greeks, is apparent in the quoted passage. If we take into account that *PM* mirrors his interest in natural philosophy, Severus turns out to be the most likely candidate for author of the Syriac version of this treatise, which can thus be dated to the middle of the seventh century.

In the following ca. hundred years, a copy of the Syriac translation came to the library of Mar Mattai, which after the fall of Qenneshre became the main intellectual center of the West Syrian Church. There, the treatise became known to the East Syrian Catholicos Timothy I, who was looking for it at the end of the eighth century. The treatise was still present in the library of the monastery in the 13th century when Barhebraeus used it while composing his theological compendium *Candelabra of Sanctuary*. A copy of the manuscript containing the treatise was made in the ninth century. The future Alexandrian Patriarch Abraham b. Zur'a brought this copy to Egypt and donated it to the Dayr al-Suryan library, where it fortunately survived up until today.

161 Cf. Arzhanov, "Plato in Syriac Literature".

2 The Treatise

2.1 The Structure of the Text

The Syriac version of the treatise *On Principles and Matter* has been preserved in ms. DS 27 most likely in fragmentary form. This characteristic of the text, however, cannot be traced back to the state of the codex in which it came down to us: Part B of ms. DS 27 contains both the beginning and the end of the preserved piece, and there is no sign of lacunas that could be explained by the loss of folios (cf. 1.2, above). The description of the treatise by Timothy I (cf. 1.1, above) makes apparent that at the end of the eighth century the Catholicos was familiar with the text, which had the same volume as the one preserved in ms. DS 27.

However, Timothy's letter includes an outline of its structure, which cannot be based on the text known to us, for the latter includes no part or chapter identifiers. Timothy's description runs as follows:

In the first *memra*, (the author of the treatise) lists the views of all the ancient philosophers and explains the Platonic Ideas and Forms. In the second *memra*, he starts to speak about Matter, species, and negation according to the Aristotelian teachings. He makes ca. 5 chapters in it, but gives no conclusion to the treatise.

Timothy speaks about two large parts (*memre*) in the treatise, the second one of which he further divides into 5 chapters. It seems that what the Catholicos defined as the first *memra* is the doxography in the beginning, while the rest of the treatise he considered as its second *memra*. This explanation seems plausible, as the remaining part of the treatise turns out to be several times longer than the first and could thus be further divided into sub-chapters.

Certain characteristics of the *PM* gave the Catholicos reason to state that the tract was written according to the "Platonic teachings" (*dogma plaṭoniqos*). Though the first part of *PM* presents a general survey of the philosophical concepts of First Principles, the rest of the treatise is focussed mainly on the views of Plato. The intention of the author to set out the Platonic "dogma" may be traced throughout the whole text, as every step in his reasoning ends with a reference to the Platonic ideas. Based on the contents of the treatise, it seems expedient to divide it into five large parts, all of which end either with an explanation of the Platonic ideas or with a reference to Plato and his philosophy.

The Syriac text as published in the present book has the following structure:

Part 1: Doxography

§§1–2 Classification of the views of the ancient philosophers.

- §§3–4 A short explanation of material principles and their relation to elements.
- §§5–6 The views of Thales, including a quotation from Homer.
- §7 Anaximenes, Diogenes, Hippasus, and Heraclitus.
- §8 Xenophanes.
- §9 Parmenides and Melissus.
- §10 Anaxagoras.
- §11 Leucippus and Democritus.
- §12 Epicurus.
- §13 Empedocles.
- §14 Aristotle.
- §15 The Stoics.
- §16 Concluding remarks on the Pythagoreans and Plato.

Part 2: Introductory Issues

- §17 Two types of the demonstrative science.
- §§18–20 Knowledge of intelligible and perceptible things.
- §§21–23 Bodies and their qualities.
- §§24–25 Matter as receptacle of the qualities.
- §26 Intellect as the active principle.
- §27–28 Platonic Ideas and Forms.

Part 3: Definition of a Principle

- §§29–30 A principle is simple.
- §31 It is unqualified.
- §32 It is eternal.
- §§33–34 It is imperishable.
- §35 Four elements may not be principles.
- §§36–37 On the reduction of multiple principles to the prior opposition of two.
- §§38–39 Three First Principles according to Plato: God, Matter, and Ideas.

Part 4: Definition of Matter

- §§40–42 Platonic and Stoic terms for Matter.
- §§43–45 Matter is unqualified and unspecified.
- §§46–47 It may potentially receive qualities.
- §§48–49 It is infinite.
- §50 Matter is a subject of the four elements.
- §§51–54 Common and specific characteristics of earth, water, fire, and air.
- §55 Matter is the primary foundation, which is receptive of qualities.
- §§56–67 Matter is neither body nor incorporeal, but body in potentiality.

Part 5: Plato's Concept of First Principles and Prime Matter

§§68–72 Summary of Plato's views on Principles and Matter.

§§73–83 Quotation from Atticus' commentary on the *Timaeus*, setting out the Platonic theory of First Principles.

§§84–86 Exposition of the teachings of Plutarch and Atticus about the relation of Matter to the First Forms.

§§87–93 Quotation from Severus' commentary on the *Timaeus*, focusing on the question of Matter and initial movement of the four elements.

§94 Plato's concept of the constitution of the world, according to Severus.

§95 Plotinus' support of the interpretation of Severus, different views of Boethus and Longinus.

§§96–97 Boethus on the kind of movement in Matter.

This division into parts has been introduced into the English translation (the published Syriac text contains only paragraph numbers) by the editor to aid navigation. However, the treatise has a very clear logical structure, which its author was eager to stress. Cf. the following remarks that either conclude one of the parts or begin a new one:

The concluding sentence of Part 1, §16: "We will speak about the principles according to the views of Plato, following what we have started (to say) above in this discourse".

The concluding sentence of Part 2, §28: "And because each one of these is a prior principle of existing things, we should first say what a principle is".

The opening sentence of Part 4, §40: "As these things have been defined in this way, we will first speak about Matter".

The last sentence of Part 4, §67: "These things which we have gathered concerning Matter may (here) come to an end for us".

The opening sentence of Part 5, §68: "Through these things that have been said clearly and very systematically, we stated the reason for Matter being necessary".

The quoted passages serve as building blocks for the structure of the text, dividing it into five main parts outlined above. These five parts, in turn, may be sub-divided into paragraphs, which usually include one argument (or a view of an ancient philosopher in the doxographical part). Thus, the division of the text into parts and paragraphs as suggested by the publisher and introduced into the edition, is based on the internal

logic of the treatise, which is clearly structured as a logical exposition and has a sort of rhythm, leading from one argument to the next.

The Platonic ideas and the interpretation of the Platonic texts (first of all of the dialogue *Timaeus*) constitute the focus of the treatise. Its author proposes an outline of the views of various philosophers on the problem of First Principles, but is mainly concerned with presenting Platonic teachings. The first, doxographical part does not contain a summary of Plato's views, but ends with a note in §16 that an exposition of these views would occupy the attention of the author after an excursus into the questions of methodology that form Part 2 of the treatise. Parts 3 and 4 may be considered as definitions of First Principles and Matter from the Platonic point of view. These definitions are later summed up at the beginning of Part 5 (§§68–72) as explicitly Platonic, based on the texts of the philosopher, which, however, demand further interpretation.

A set of commentaries on the key-texts of the dialogue *Timaeus*, offered in Part 5 of the treatise, turns out to be of special interest to historians of philosophy. It contains extensive quotations from the lost commentaries on Plato's *Timaeus* of the renowned Middle Platonists Atticus and Severus, whose works were read in the school of Plotinus and thus became well known to the presumed author of the treatise, Porphyry. These quotations are supplied by a short quotation from Boethus (probably, a 2nd century Platonist) and by references to Plutarch and to Porphyry's teachers, Longinus and Plotinus.

The doxography, which forms the first part of the treatise, does not present a very original overview of philosophical ideas, as there remains little doubt that it was borrowed by the author of the treatise from other sources. However, it gives us an interesting example of a philosophical genre that is rather under-represented in Syriac literature¹⁶², and it is worth dwelling on this part of the text before moving to its main arguments focused on First Principles and Matter.

2.2 The Doxography (Part 1, §§1–16)

PM begins with an extensive doxographical¹⁶³ section, presenting the views of philosophers on the number of First Principles and their main characteristics. This tradition goes back to Aristotle. We find a doxographical section at the beginning of his *Physics*

¹⁶² For the Syriac tradition of doxography, see Arzhanov, *Syriac Sayings of Greek Philosophers*, 127–133; Arzhanov, “Greek Philosophers in Monastic Schools”.

¹⁶³ The term was coined by Hermann Diels in his classical study: Diels, *Doxographi Graeci*. Jaap Mansfeldt and David Runia have made a revision of Diels' theory, see Mansfeld & Runia, *Aëtiana*, vol. 1 (cf. also vols. 2–5; *Aëtiana* V is a 4-volume new edition of the *Placita*). For the history of doxography, see Runia, “What is Doxography?”.

(and in the first book of the *Metaphysics*), where the philosopher discussed the number and types of First Principles as understood by the earlier tradition, especially by the so-called “natural philosophers”, i.e. thinkers prior to Socrates who focused on the philosophy of nature. In *Phys.* I.2 we read¹⁶⁴:

There must be either one principle or more than one. If one, it must be either unchangeable, the view of Parmenides and Melissus, or subject to change, the view of the physicists, of whom some make air and others water the primary principle. If there are more principles than one, they must be either limited in number — that is, there are either two, three, four, or some such definite number of them — or unlimited.

This short doxographical account was further elaborated by later commentators of the Aristotelian works. Already Aristotle’s successor as the head of the Academy, Theophrastus, composed a treatise τῶν φυσικῶν δόξαι in sixteen books, according to Diogenes Laertius¹⁶⁵. Theophrastus’ work was accessible to a certain Aetius, who probably lived in the late first to the early second century AD. The work of Aetius was adopted by Arius Didymus (1st–3rd c. AD?) and in the second century AD by an unknown author of the treatise *Placita Philosophorum* (“Tenets of the philosophers”) transmitted under the name of Plutarch. In the fifth century, the work of Aetius was used by Stobaeus, who incorporated large portions from it into his anthology¹⁶⁶.

The compendium of Ps.-Plutarch was known to a number of Christian authors, who included parts of it in their polemical works; e.g., Eusebius of Caesarea in the tenth book of his *Praeparatio Evangelica* gave extensive quotations from the work of Ps.-Plutarch, whose title Eusebius quoted as δόξαι φιλοσόφων περὶ ἀρχῶν¹⁶⁷. (Ps.-)Justin Martyr included portions from it in the *Cohortatio ad Graecos*¹⁶⁸, and Clement of Alexandria used it as a source for the eighth book of his *Stromateis*, where he presented an overview of philosophical ideas¹⁶⁹.

¹⁶⁴ Arist., *Phys.* I 2, 184b15–25: Ἀνάγκη δ’ ἥτοι μίαν εἶναι τὴν ἀρχὴν ἢ πλείους, καὶ εἰ μίαν, ἥτοι ἀκίνητον, ὥς φησι Παρμενίδης καὶ Μέλισσος, ἢ κινουμένην, ὥσπερ οἱ φυσικοί, οἱ μὲν ἀέρα φάσκοντες εἶναι οἱ δ’ ὕδωρ τὴν πρώτην ἀρχήν· εἰ δὲ πλείους, ἢ πεπερασμένas ἢ ἀπείρους, καὶ εἰ πεπερασμένas πλείους δὲ μᾶς, ἢ δύο ἢ τρεῖς ἢ τέτταρας ἢ ἄλλον τινὰ ἀριθμόν. The English translation is adapted from Charlton, *Aristotle, Physics*, 1–2.

¹⁶⁵ Diels reconstructed this treatise of Theophrastus, whom he considered to be the founder of the tradition of doxography, from the sixth century work of Simplicius; see Diels, *Doxographi Graeci*, 475–481. The fragments of Theophrastus were published anew in: Fortenbaugh, *Theophrastus of Eresus*.

¹⁶⁶ The texts of Ps.-Plutarch, Stobaeus, and Ps.-Galen as *testimonia* for the work of Aetius were published synoptically by Hermann Diels. Cf. a new edition of all extant witnesses to Aetius’ work: Mansfeld & Runia, *Aëtiana V*.

¹⁶⁷ Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* XIV.14 (293.18 Mras & des Places).

¹⁶⁸ See *Cohortatio ad Graecos*, ch. 3–4 (27–28 Markovich).

¹⁶⁹ Havrda, *The So-Called Eighth ‘Stromateus’ by Clement of Alexandria*.

The work of Aetius was probably the most popular, but not the only, example of doxography. An independent branch of this tradition, which was not directly dependent on Aetius, has come down to us in the tenth book of the polemical work *Refutatio omnium haeresium* ascribed to Hippolytus of Rome¹⁷⁰. This work is of special interest for the analysis of *PM*, as its doxographical account turns out to be particularly close to the latter¹⁷¹:

At least some of the Greek dogmatists divided philosophy into three parts and developed their philosophies according to one of the three divisions. Some focused on what they call natural philosophy, others on ethical philosophy, and still others on dialectic. Those who preferred natural philosophy arose and discoursed as follows:

Some say that everything was born from one, others from several things; and of those who have generated them from one, some have done so from an unqualified and others from a qualified thing; and of those who have done so from a qualified thing, some make this air, others water, others fire, others earth; and of those who have generated all from several things, some have done so from numerable things, others from things infinite in number; and of those who adopt numerables, some make them two, others four, others five, others six.

The summary of Greek natural philosophy, which we find after the words “as follows”, starts with the same words that occur at the beginning of *PM*. This fact binds the two texts with each other, though the rest of the doxographical accounts in them differ in many details. It seems likely that both the *Refutatio* and *PM* made use of a common source, which started with the quoted words.

This source was used at approximately the same time as the *Refutatio*, i.e. at the end of the second to the beginning of the third century AD, by Sextus Empiricus in his

170 For (Ps.-)Hippolytus' *Refutatio* and its place in the tradition of *Placita*, see Osborne, *Rethinking Early Greek Philosophy*; Mansfeld, *Heresiography in Context*. For the Arabic reception of this work, see Rudolph, *Die Doxographie des Pseudo-Ammonios*.

171 (Ps.-)Hippolytus, *Refutatio omnium haeresium* X.6.1–3: οἱ μὲν γε τῶν Ἑλλήνων δογματισταὶ τὴν φιλοσοφίαν τριχῇ διελόντες οὕτως ἐφιλοσόφησαν, οἱ μὲν φυσικὴν, οἱ δὲ ἠθικὴν, οἱ δὲ διαλεκτικὴν (αὐτὴν) προσαγορεύσαντες. καὶ οἱ μὲν τὴν φυσικὴν (προτιμήσαντες) οὗτοι γεγέννηται, οὕτως τε διηγήσαντο. Οἱ μὲν ἐξ ἑνὸς (ἐγέννησαν) τὰ πάντα, οἱ δὲ ἐκ πλειόνων· καὶ τῶν ἐξ ἑνὸς οἱ μὲν ἐξ ἀποίου, οἱ δὲ ἐκ [τοῦ] ποιοῦ· καὶ τῶν ἐκ ποιοῦ οἱ μὲν ἐκ πυρός, οἱ δὲ ἐξ ἀέρος, οἱ δὲ ἐξ ὕδατος, ἄλλοι δὲ ἐκ γῆς. καὶ (τῶν) ἐκ πλειόνων οἱ μὲν ἐξ ἀριθμητῶν, (οἱ δὲ ἐξ ἀπείρων· καὶ τῶν ἐξ ἀριθμητῶν) οἱ μὲν ἐκ δυ(εἰ)ν, οἱ δὲ ἐκ(κ) τεσσάρων, οἱ δὲ ἐκ πέντε, οἱ δὲ ἐξ ἑξ. (380–381 Marcovich). The English translation is adapted from Litwa, *Refutation of All Heresies*, 699, 701.

tract *Against the Physicists*¹⁷². Sextus, who was part of the Empiricist school of medicine (hence his name), in this part of his polemical treatise was elaborating upon the topic of coming-to-be and perishing. In so doing, he did not focus primarily on Aristotelian physics, but gave an overview of the theories of ancient philosophers on First Principles, including the same taxonomy that appears in the *Refutatio* and in *PM* §1¹⁷³:

The investigation of coming-to-be and perishing that the Sceptics assemble against the Physicists is more or less about the Universe, given that of those who have inquired into the constitution of the all, some have generated everything from one, some from multiple things; and of those who have done so from one, some say it is something without qualities, others something with qualities, and of those who have done so from something with qualities, some say it is fire, some air, some water, and others earth; and of those who have done so from multiple things, some say it is a countable number of things, some an infinite number, and of those who have done so from a countable number, some say it is two, some four, some five, some six.

It remains a matter of debate whether the author of the *Refutatio* was familiar with the work of Sextus, or if both texts go back to a common source¹⁷⁴. The latter assumption turns out to be more likely, for similar classifications of ancient philosophers according to their views on First Principles appear in a number of other authors, e.g. in Simplicius' commentary on Aristotle's *Physics*¹⁷⁵.

It was also included in the Alexandrian epitome of Galen's treatise *On Elements According to Hippocrates*¹⁷⁶. In this work, Galen spoke about the "elements" (στοιχεῖα) both in terms of qualities (the hot, the cold, the wet, and the dry) and in terms of

172 The two books of *Against the Physicists* are traditionally considered Books 9 and 10 of the larger corpus that bears the title *Against the Mathematicians*, cf. Algra & Ierodiakonou, *Sextus Empiricus and Ancient Physics*, 3–7.

173 Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus Mathematicos* X, 310–318: Ἡ περὶ γενέσεως καὶ φθορᾶς ζητήσις συνίσταται τοῖς σκεπτικοῖς πρὸς τοὺς φυσικοὺς σχεδὸν τι περὶ τῶν ὅλων, εἴγε τῶν σκεψαμένων περὶ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς συστάσεως οἱ μὲν ἐξ ἑνὸς ἐγέννησαν τὰ πάντα, οἱ δ' ἐκ πλειόνων, καὶ τῶν ἐξ ἑνὸς οἱ μὲν ἐξ ἀποίου, οἱ δὲ ἐκ ποιού, καὶ τῶν ἐκ ποιού οἱ μὲν ἐκ πυρὸς, οἱ δ' ἐξ ἄερος, οἱ δ' ἐξ ὕδατος, ἄλλοι ἐκ γῆς, καὶ τῶν ἐκ πλειόνων οἱ μὲν ἐξ ἀριθμητῶν, οἱ δ' ἐξ ἀπείρων, καὶ τῶν ἐξ ἀριθμητῶν οἱ μὲν ἐκ δύο, οἱ δ' ἐκ τεσσάρων, οἱ δ' ἐκ πέντε, οἱ δ' ἐξ ἑξ. (366–367 Mutschmann). The English translation is adapted with some modifications from: Bett, *Sextus Empiricus*, 136–137.

174 Cf. Janáček, "Hippolytus and Sextus Empiricus"; Mansfeld, *Heresiography in Context*, 317–318; Algra & Ierodiakonou, *Sextus Empiricus and Ancient Physics*, 365–372.

175 Simplicius, *In Arist. Phys.* I 2, 184b15 (25–26 Diels). The similarity between Sextus, the *Refutatio*, and Simplicius was noticed already by Hermann Diels (Diels, *Doxographi Graeci*, 93 n. 2), who suggested that they all go back to the same source.

176 De Lacy, *Galen De elementis ex Hippocratis*. For the Alexandrian reception of Galen's works, see Overwien, *Medizinische Lehrwerke*.

bodies (fire, air, water, and earth). He also brought the elements of human bodies into connection with the cosmic elements and understood the elements as qualities upon the background of the quality-less matter (ἡ ἄποιος ὕλη), thus adopting the Stoic terminology. The Alexandrian epitome of Galen's *On Elements* further elaborated on this point, starting the part on the elements with a doxography. This epitome has been preserved in an Arabic translation, which begins with a doxographical account of the philosophers' views on what were considered cosmic elements that understood to be principles of physical bodies¹⁷⁷. It is likely that this doxography derives from the same source, which was used by both Sextus and the author of *Refutatio* in the late second century.

As Jaap Mansfeld has pointed out¹⁷⁸, the doxographical forms were to a large extent dependent on the school function of the texts: the classification of the views of philosophers was a practical form that could be used for pedagogical purposes¹⁷⁹. The Alexandrian epitome of Galen's *On Elements* thus serves as a witness to the use of doxographies in medical training, which in Alexandria developed parallel to philosophical education (cf. the example of Sergius of Resh'ayna).

Porphyry of Tyre was one of the authors whose name was associated with the doxographical literature. Around 431, Theodoret, a Christian bishop (in ca. 423–466) of Cyrrhus, a town in North Syria (ca. 65 km north of Aleppo), composed a polemical work *On the Cure of Hellenic Diseases* (*De Graecarum affectionum curatione*)¹⁸⁰, in which he suggested a Christianized picture of Platonic philosophy¹⁸¹. In his work, Theodoret used a large number of sources, which also included three doxographical works¹⁸²:

Plutarch and Aetius taught about the tenets of the philosophers. Porphyry occupied himself with the same issue and he has attached the sayings to the biographies of each (philosopher).

¹⁷⁷ The Arabic version of the Epitome was allegedly produced by Ḥunayn ibn Isḥaq and has been preserved in various recensions, see Walbridge, *The Alexandrian Epitomes of Galen*, vol. 1; Bos & Langermann, "An Epitome of Galen's *On The Element*".

¹⁷⁸ Mansfeld, "Doxography and Dialectic", 3061–3062. According to Mansfeld, the active use of doxographies as separate works goes back to the skeptical school of philosophy in the third cent. BC and is connected to medical education.

¹⁷⁹ For the pedagogical role of the doxography, see especially Hans Daiber, "Hellenistisch-kaiserzeitliche Doxographie".

¹⁸⁰ See Scholten, *Theodoret, De Graecarum affectionum curatione*.

¹⁸¹ For the apologetic program of Theodoret's *Curatio*, see Siniosoglou, *Plato and Theodoret*.

¹⁸² Theodoret, *De Graecarum affectionum curatione*, §95: Πλούταρχος δὲ καὶ Ἄετιος τὰς τῶν φιλοσόφων ἐκπαιδεύουσι δόξας· τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ καὶ ὁ Πορφύριος ἀνεδέξατο πόνον, τὸν ἐκάστου βίον ταῖς δόξαις προστεθεικώς (242, 244 Scholten). The English translation is mine.

Thus, Theodoret pointed at Porphyry as a transmitter of doxographical accounts, who was comparable to Plutarch and Aetius. Porphyry's work, which the bishop of Cyrrhus most likely had in mind, was the *Philosophical History* that contained not only biographies of philosophers, but also their sayings, which, as Theodoret notes, were attached to the biographical parts (cf. a similar structure in Diogenes Laertius' *Lives of the Philosophers*). The preserved fragments from this work¹⁸³ (the only completely preserved book of it is the *Life of Pythagoras*¹⁸⁴) confirm this assumption. In his commentary on Aristotle's *Physics*, Simplicius often refers to Porphyry as his source on the views of pre-Socratics, thus corroborating Theodoret's statement¹⁸⁵.

Theodoret's polemical treatise serves as an important witness of the accessibility of doxographical works for Syrian scholars in the late antique and early medieval periods¹⁸⁶. It also presents Porphyry as an important source of doxographical information. Especially, his *Philosophical History*, which was known probably in Greek to Theodoret in the fifth century and later was partly translated into Syriac¹⁸⁷, contained extensive doxographical portions. In addition, Porphyry's extant works present their author as deeply interested in the history of philosophy and doxographical accounts.

The treatise *On Principles and Matter*, which ultimately derives from Plotinus' disciple, thus serves as a further witness to Porphyry's interest in doxography. The first part of *PM* was borrowed by Porphyry from the same source, which was known to Sextus Empiricus and the author of the *Refutatio* at the end of the second to the beginning of the third century AD, but which most likely had had a long pre-history due to its use in philosophical and medical education.

183 See Smith, *Porphyrii Philosophi Fragmenta*, 220–247.

184 Des Places, *Porphyre. Vie de Pythagore*.

185 See, e.g., Simplicius, *In Arist. Phys.* I 4, 187a12 (149.11–18 Diels); I 4, 187a29 (163.16–20 Diels); I 4, 187b7 (165.8–10, 166.3–5 Diels); I 5, 188b30 (188.32–189.1 Diels). The main source for Simplicius was the compendium of Theophrastus. However, Simplicius refers to Porphyry as to a separate source.

186 The familiarity with Ps.-Plutarch's *Placita Philosophorum*, which was in ninth century translated into Arabic by the Christian Qusṭā ibn Luqā (see Daiber, *Aetius Arabus*), is apparent in various Syrian writers of the early Islamic period. E.g., the eighth century East Syriac author Theodore bar Koni in his *Book of Scholia* included short summaries of the philosophy of Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle, Stoics, and Epicureans that bear a strong similarity to Aetius' work. See Addai Scher, *Theodorus Bar Kōnī Liber scholiorum II*, 292–293; Hespel & Draguet, *Theodore bar Konai*, 218. Cf. Baumstark, "Griechische Philosophen und ihre Lehren", 2–17.

187 Flügel, *Kitāb al-Fihrist*, vol. 1, 253. See 2.6, below.

2.3 Introductory Issues (Part 2, §§17–28)

As Timothy I noted in his description, the treatise that aroused his interest aimed at elucidating the “Platonic teachings” (*dogma platōniqos*). The doxographical part finishes with a note that Plato’s views on First Principles may be excluded from it (§16). It is apparent that they should not have been mentioned briefly among the views of other philosophers in the introduction because the whole treatise focuses on the interpretation of the Platonic notion of First Principles. The main source text was the *Timaeus*, and Part 2 appears to some extent to be a commentary on *Tim.* 27c–30a, which the author quotes several times verbatim¹⁸⁸.

However, before turning to the exposition of the key-passages of the *Timaeus*, which comes in the last part of the treatise, the author finds it necessary to set out some introductory issues of “the demonstrative science” (§17). In his description, Timothy I points out that what he calls “the second *memra*” is written to a large extent “according to the Aristotelian teachings” (*dogma aristotelīqos*). Indeed, the beginning of the second part of the treatise (especially §§17 and 20) focuses on Aristotle’s logical categories:

(§17) We ought to know that there are two types of the demonstrative science. One (type) is by means of prior things to demonstrate the posterior. It is characteristic of syllogisms. Those first compositions from which conclusions are drawn are prior. Another (type) is by means of posterior things to demonstrate the prior. It is characteristic of the introductory science. And now, as our discourse is about principles, prior to which nothing may be thought, we employ the initial type of the demonstrative science.

⟨...⟩

(§20) The perceptible things are prior in relation to us, but are secondary in relation to nature. Further, the intelligible things are prior in relation to nature, but are secondary in relation to our perception. As those things which are prior in relation to us are posterior in relation to nature, we will start moving from the introductory argument and ascend to those things that are properly and truly called principles.

These paragraphs are based to a large extent on the *Posterior Analytics*, in which Aristotle defines two types of existing things as follows¹⁸⁹:

¹⁸⁸ In §19, *PM* quotes *Tim.* 28a1–3. In §25, a short passage from *Tim.* 30a4–5 appears.

¹⁸⁹ Arist., *An. Post.* I 2, 71b32–72a5: πρότερα δ’ ἐστὶ καὶ γνωριμώτερα διχῶς· οὐ γὰρ ταῦτόν πρότερον τῇ φύσει καὶ πρὸς ἡμᾶς πρότερον, οὐδὲ γνωριμώτερον καὶ ἡμῖν γνωριμώτερον. λέγω δὲ πρὸς ἡμᾶς μὲν πρότερα καὶ γνωριμώτερα τὰ ἐγγύτερον τῆς αἰσθήσεως, ἀπλῶς δὲ πρότερα καὶ γνωριμώτερα τὰ πορρώτερον. ἔστι δὲ πορρωτάτω μὲν τὰ καθόλου μάλιστα, ἐγγυτάτω δὲ τὰ καθ’ ἕκαστα· καὶ ἀντίκειται ταῦτ’ ἀλλήλοις. The English translation is adapted from Barnes, *Aristotle. Posterior Analytics*, 3.

Things are prior and more familiar in two ways; for it is not the same to be prior by nature and prior in relation to us, nor to be more familiar and more familiar to us. I call prior and more familiar in relation to us items which are nearer to perception, prior and more familiar *simpliciter* items which are further away. What is most universal is furthest away, and the particulars are nearest — these are opposite to each other.

Another important source for the paragraphs quoted above is the beginning of Aristotle's *Physics*. As already noted in the previous section, the first, doxographical part of the treatise finds a parallel in the second chapter of the *Physics*, where Aristotle sums up the main views of the earlier philosophers on First Principles (*Phys.* I 2, 184b15–25), a summary which was later elaborated by his successor Theophrastus and which formed the core of the tradition that became known to us from Ps.-Plutarch's *Placita Philosophorum*. The doxography on First Principles in chapter 2 of the *Physics* is preceded by the first chapter, where the philosopher sets out a definition of knowledge¹⁹⁰. This chapter turns out to be another important source for the *PM*¹⁹¹:

In all disciplines in which there is systematic knowledge of things with principles, causes, or elements, it arises from a grasp of those: we think we have knowledge of a thing when we have found its primary causes and principles, and followed it back to its elements. Clearly, then, systematic knowledge of nature must start with an attempt to settle questions about principles. The natural course is to proceed from what is clearer and more knowable to us, to what is more knowable and clear by nature; for the two are not the same. Hence we must start thus with things which are less clear by nature, but clearer to us, and move on to things which are by nature clearer and more knowable. The things which

¹⁹⁰ For the relation between Book 1 of the *Physics* and the *Posterior Analytics*, see Horstschäfer, 'Über Prinzipien', 13–18.

¹⁹¹ Arist., *Phys.* I 1, 184a10–184b14: 'Ἐπειδὴ τὸ εἰδέναι καὶ τὸ ἐπίστασθαι συμβαίνει περὶ πάσας τὰς μεθόδους, ὧν εἰσὶν ἀρχαὶ ἢ αἰτία ἢ στοιχεῖα, ἐκ τοῦ ταῦτα γνωρίζειν (τότε γὰρ οἰόμεθα γινώσκειν ἕκαστον, ὅταν τὰ αἰτία γνωρίσωμεν τὰ πρῶτα καὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς τὰς πρῶτας καὶ μέχρι τῶν στοιχείων), δῆλον ὅτι καὶ τῆς περὶ φύσεως ἐπιστήμης πειρατέον διορίσασθαι πρῶτον τὰ περὶ τὰς ἀρχάς. πέφυκε δὲ ἐκ τῶν γνωριμωτέρων ἡμῖν ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ σαφεστέρων ἐπὶ τὰ σαφέστερα τῇ φύσει καὶ γνωριμώτερα· οὐ γὰρ ταῦτά ἡμῖν τε γνώριμα καὶ ἀπλῶς, διόπερ ἀνάγκη τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον προάγειν ἐκ τῶν ἀσαφεστέρων μὲν τῇ φύσει ἡμῖν δὲ σαφεστέρων ἐπὶ τὰ σαφέστερα τῇ φύσει καὶ γνωριμώτερα. ἔστι δ' ἡμῖν τὸ πρῶτον δῆλα καὶ σαφὴ τὰ συγκεχυμένα μᾶλλον· ὕστερον δ' ἐκ τούτων γίνεται γνώριμα τὰ στοιχεῖα καὶ αἱ ἀρχαὶ διαιροῦσι ταῦτα. The English translation is adapted from Charlton, *Aristotle. Physics. Books I and II*, 1.

are in the first instance clear and plain to us are rather those which are compounded. It is only later, through an analysis of these, that we come to know elements and principles.

The second part of the treatise (§§17–28), which sets out the “introductory science”, combines questions of natural philosophy with logical definitions. This combination, which becomes standard for the Neo-Platonic commentators of Aristotelian texts, is rather unusual for the previous, so-called Middle Platonic period of philosophy, which is characterised by the intention to set apart not only Aristotelian logic and Platonic cosmology, but also the teachings of the two great philosophers in general. E.g., Atticus composed a discourse addressed against “those who interpret Plato through Aristotle”¹⁹². Although the author of *PM* refers to Atticus as one of the authoritative interpreters of Platonic texts, he nevertheless does not share the critical bias of his predecessor. Instead, he integrates elements of Aristotle’s logic and natural philosophy into his argument, not as something that potentially may contradict Plato’s views, but as the “introductory science”, a sort of propaedeutic with an instrumental role.

Such an attitude to Aristotelian logic as an “instrument” (an *Organon*) that leads to a better understanding of the Platonic dialogues appears already in the “Handbook of Platonism” (*Didaskalikos*) attributed to Alcinous and dated to the third century AD¹⁹³. It became characteristic of the Alexandrian pedagogical system, especially after Ammonius, son of Hermias. Together with the author of the *Didaskalikos* and approximately in the same period, Porphyry was eager to bring the two great philosophers into an agreement, and later Platonists (starting with his student Iamblichus) were greatly indebted to his writings¹⁹⁴. *PM* reflects the philosophical position of Porphyry, who made his name both as a commentator on Platonic dialogues and as an interpreter of the Aristotelian works. This characteristic serves as another argument for ascribing the original Greek version of *PM* to Plotinus’ disciple.

By “employing the initial type of the demonstrative science” (§17), the treatise suggest to “start moving from the introductory argument and ascend to those things that are properly and truly called principles” (§20). In so doing, the author turns to the four elements, or “bodies” (fire, air, water, and earth), associated with certain qualities (§§21–23). The question of where these bodies and qualities are set brings the argument to the idea of Matter as “one principle of everything” (§24). However,

¹⁹² Eusebius of Caesarea refers to this work of Atticus in *Preparatio Evangelica* XI.1.2: Πρὸς τοὺς διὰ τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους τὰ Πλάτωνος ὑποσχνομένους (II 6.19 ff Mras = Fr. 1 des Places). George Karamanolis has argued that the quoted words should be understood not as a title, but rather the contents of Atticus’ work: Karamanolis, *Plato and Aristotle in Agreement?*, 151–152.

¹⁹³ Cf. particularly ch. 5–6 of this work. See Dillon, *Alcinous*, 8–13.

¹⁹⁴ Cf. Karamanolis, “Why did Porphyry write Aristotelian commentaries?”

the ordered state of Matter makes it apparent that there is Intellect, which brought forth the order and beauty of the material world.

In §26, the author sums up the arguments on the role of God (the Demiurge) in the following way:

But pleasant order (τάξις) and beauty do not exist without harmony (ἁρμονία). And also harmony does not exist without proportion (ἄναλογία?). And proportion does not exist without reason (λόγος). And such reason does not exist without foresight and foreknowledge (ἡ πρόνοια καὶ ἡ πρόγνωσις), while the latter do not exist without intellect (νοῦς). Thus, when intellect sets in motion through its actions, it imprints, adjusts, arranges, and sets in order species, qualities, and shapes.

Thus, the series of syllogisms based on the Aristotelian logic brings the author to the idea of the Maker who created all existing things with foresight. A similar summary of Plato's views on the generation of the world appears in Atticus' treatise mentioned above, *Against those who interpret Plato through Aristotle*. Eusebius of Caesarea quotes a large portion from this work as a proof of the doctrine of God's providence (πρόνοια)¹⁹⁵:

First of all, when Plato was looking into the question of the generation of the cosmos, he also had it in mind that this great and beneficial doctrine of providence needed thorough investigation. He realised that there was no need to posit an agent of creation or preservation for something that did not come into being in good order; so, to make sure he did not deprive the cosmos of providence, he did away with the idea that it was ungenerated.

The passage preserved by Eusebius presents allegedly a traditional doctrine, which the author of *PM* could have found not only by Atticus, whom he explicitly quotes in Part 5, but also by various other Platonists¹⁹⁶. By turning to this doctrine at the end of the introductory part, the author lays the groundwork for the Platonist concept of three First Principles — God, Matter, and Ideas, — which he articulates at the end of

¹⁹⁵ Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* XV.6.2: Πρώτον δὲ περὶ γενέσεως κόσμου σκοπῶν καὶ τὸ τῆς προνοίας τὸ μέγα τοῦτο καὶ πολυωφελὲς δόγμα πάντα ζητεῖν ἀναγκαῖον ἡγούμενος καὶ λογισάμενος, ὅτι τῷ μὴ γενομένῳ οὔτε τινὸς ποιητοῦ οὔτε τινὸς κηδεμόνος πρὸς τὸ γενέσθαι καλῶς χρεῖα, ἵνα μὴ ἀποστερήσῃ τὸν κόσμον τῆς προνοίας ἀφεῖλε τὸ ἀγέννητον αὐτοῦ. (359.7ff Mras & des Places = Fr. 4 des Places). The English translation is adapted from Boys-Stones, *Platonist Philosophy 80 BC to AD 250*, 202.

¹⁹⁶ See Baltes, *Die Weltentstehung*, vol. 1, 51–53. Cf. Koch, *Pronoia und Paideusis*.

the next part (§39). However, before coming to this concept, the author finds it necessary to define what a First Principle is and in what sense Matter may be considered a principle.

2.4 Definition of First Principles and Matter (Parts 3 and 4, §§29–67)

Parts 3 and 4 of the treatise may also be characterised as introductory, for they aim at defining the First Principles, among which Matter appears as a category in its own right. In these parts, the author of the treatise shows himself to be a Platonist polemicising both against the Aristotelian concept of First Principles and against the views of the Stoics and Epicureans¹⁹⁷.

In §§29–34, the author suggests the following definition of a principle: it must be simple, unqualified, eternal, and imperishable. The last two categories could have caused potential discussion with Christian philosophers, who of course were eager to stress that only God is eternal, so that only God can generally be called the First Principle of all existing things, while this category could not be transmitted to other things, like Matter or Platonic Forms, which for Christian interpreters could not be considered eternal in the same sense as God¹⁹⁸. It is evident, however, that this discussion is not present in *PM*, whose author, while arguing against his opponents, does not have in mind the Christian point of view.

His critique is directed against those thinkers who assume that the four elements (fire, earth, water, and air) are “the First Principles from which existing things come to be” (§35). The author of *PM* rejects this assumption with the argument that something that comes to be cannot be a principle, thus polemicising against the “natural philosophers”, whose views he outlined in the doxographical part at the beginning of the treatise.

The same argument, which we find in §§29–35, appears in a compressed form in the doxography of Aetius preserved in Ps.-Plutarch’s *Placita Philosophorum*¹⁹⁹:

¹⁹⁷ For an overview of various concepts of First Principles, see Boys-Stones, *Platonist Philosophy 80 BC to AD 250*, 83–88.

¹⁹⁸ Cf. Karamanolis, *The Philosophy of Early Christianity*, 60–116.

¹⁹⁹ Ps.-Plutarch, *Placita Philosophorum* I.1.2: Τίνι διαφέρει ἀρχὴ καὶ στοιχεῖα. Οἱ μὲν οὖν περὶ Ἀριστοτέλην καὶ Πλάτωνα διαφέρειν ἡγοῦνται ἀρχὴν καὶ στοιχεῖα. Θαλῆς δὲ ὁ Μιλήσιος ταῦτον νομίζει ἀρχὴν καὶ στοιχεῖα. πλείστον δὲ ὅσον διαφέρει ἀλλήλων· τὰ μὲν γὰρ στοιχεῖα ἐστὶ σύνθετα· τὰς δὲ ἀρχὰς φαμεν εἶναι οὔτε συνθέτους οὔτε ἀποτελέσματα· οἷον στοιχεῖα μὲν καλοῦμεν γῆν ὕδωρ ἀέρα πῦρ, ἀρχὰς δὲ λέγομεν διὰ τοῦτο, ὅτι οὐκ ἔχει τι πρότερον ἐξ οὗ γεννᾶται, ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἔσται ἀρχὴ τοῦτο, ἀλλὰ ἐκεῖνο ἐξ οὗ γηγένηται. τῆς δὲ γῆς καὶ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐστὶ τίνα πρότερα ἐξ ὧν γέγονεν, ἡ ὕλη ἄμορφος οὕσα καὶ ἀειδής, καὶ τὸ εἶδος ὃ καλοῦμεν ἐντελέχειαν, καὶ ἡ στέρησις. ἀμαρτάνει οὖν ὁ Θαλῆς στοιχεῖον καὶ ἀρχὴν λέγων τὸ ὕδωρ (275a–276a Diels). The English translation is adapted with some modifications from Boys-Stones, *Platonist Philosophy 80 BC to AD 250*, 92.

How a principle differs from an element:

Followers of Aristotle and Plato think that a principle is different from an element, but Thales of Miletus thinks that the same thing is a principle and an element. The greatest difference between them: elements are compounds, but we say that principles are neither compounds nor products. So, for example, we call earth, water, air, fire “elements”; but we call something a “principle” because there is nothing prior to it, out of which it is generated (if there were, it is not this thing that would be the principle, but that from which it had been generated). But there are things prior to earth and water, from which they arise: shapeless and formless matter, the form (which we call “completion”), and privation. So, Thales is wrong when he says that water is element and principle.

In Aetius (Ps.-Plutarch) we find the same line of argumentation as in *PM*, whose author thus turns out to be a follower of both Aristotle and Plato in criticizing the ideas of pre-Socratics. “Some people before Plato” (§36) stated that there were pairs of First Principles: e.g., hot and cold, love and strife, one and many. This concept becomes the next object of criticism. The opponents whom the author has in mind are apparently the Pythagoreans, about whom Simplicius writes in his commentary on Aristotle’s *Physics*²⁰⁰:

The Pythagoreans posited the contraries as secondary and elementary principles not only for physical things, but simply for all that comes after the One, which they asserted to be the principle of all things, and they subordinated (to the contraries) the two coordinated series, which are no longer properly principles.

In the next paragraphs (§§36–37), the author turns to the concept of two First Principles, which are not just opposite but related to each other as an active and a passive principle. This is the idea which Diogenes Laertius ascribes to the Stoics²⁰¹:

200 Simplicius, *In Arist. Phys.* I 5, 188a19: οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι δὲ οὐ τῶν φυσικῶν μόνων ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντων ἀπλῶς μετὰ τὸ ἓν, ὃ πάντων ἀρχὴν ἔλεγον, ἀρχὰς δευτέρας καὶ στοιχειώδεις τὰ ἐναντία ἐτίθεσαν, αἷς καὶ τὰς δύο συστοιχίας ὑπέταττον οὐκέτι κυρίως ἀρχαῖς οὐσίαις (181.7–10 Diels). The English translation is adapted from Baltussen et al., *Simplicius. On Aristotle Physics 1.5–9*, 18.

201 Diogenes Laertius VII.134: Δοκεῖ δ’ αὐτοῖς ἀρχὰς εἶναι τῶν ὅλων δύο, τὸ ποιοῦν καὶ τὸ πάσχον. τὸ μὲν οὖν πάσχον εἶναι τὴν ἀποιον οὐσίαν, τὴν ὕλην, τὸ δὲ ποιοῦν τὸν ἐν αὐτῇ λόγον τὸν θεόν· τοῦτον γὰρ αἰδίδιον ὄντα διὰ πάσης αὐτῆς δημιουργεῖν ἕκαστα. (...) διαφέρειν δὲ φασιν ἀρχὰς καὶ στοιχεῖα· τὰς μὲν γὰρ εἶναι ἀγενήτους καὶ ἀφθάρτους, τὰ δὲ στοιχεῖα κατὰ τὴν ἐκπύρωσιν φθείρεσθαι. ἀλλὰ καὶ σωμμάτα εἶναι τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ ἀμόρφους, τὰ δὲ μεμορφῶσθαι. (552 Dorandi). The English translation is adapted with some modifications from Hicks, *Diogenes Laertius*, 239. Cf. Gourinat, “The Stoics on Matter and Prime Matter”.

They (i.e. Stoics) suppose that there are two principles of the universe, the active principle and the passive. The passive principle, then, is unqualified substance, i.e. Matter, whereas the active is the reason inherent in this substance, i.e. God. For he is everlasting and is the artificer of each several thing throughout the whole extent of Matter. (...) There is a difference, according to them, between principles and elements; the former being without generation or destruction, whereas the elements are destroyed when all things are resolved into fire. Moreover, the principles are incorporeal and without form, while the elements have been endowed with form.

In accordance with the Stoic philosophy, §38 identifies the active principle with God and the passive one with Matter. The author, however, does not say explicitly that he thus defends the Stoic ideas. Apparently, he considered this concept as Platonic. In fact, Simplicius writes that the doctrine of the two principles, God and Matter, was attributed to Plato already by Theophrastus, whom he quotes as follows²⁰²:

(Plato) wished to make the principles two in number, one underlying (things) as Matter – and this he calls “receptive of all things”; the other being cause and source of movement, and this he attaches to the power of God and of the Good.

The notion of a principle that is a “source of movement” will be discussed by Atticus, who thus considered it possible to speak of four principles (see below). But it is interesting to note that *PM* easily combines various notions, some of which were considered purely Platonic, and others as Stoic. In the next paragraph (§39), the author states that there are in fact three principles of the existing things: God, Matter, and First Ideas. This conclusion breaks somewhat abruptly the whole line of reasoning in Part 3, bringing up the traditional Middle Platonic triad of First Principles²⁰³.

Having thus defined the First Principles, the author shifts the focus of the discussion to Prime Matter as one of them. This topic occupies the central position in the rest of the treatise, first as a theoretical question in Part 4 and further in relation to Plato’s dialogue *Timaeus* in Part 5.

Part 4 begins in §40–41 with the definition of the term “matter”. Although the idea of Matter was present already in the philosophy of the Pythagoreans and that of

²⁰² Simplicius, *In Arist. Phys.* I 2, 184b15: ἐν ἧ δύο τὰς ἀρχὰς βούλεται ποιεῖν τὸ μὲν ὑποκείμενον ὡς ὕλην ὃ προσαγορεύει πανδεχές, τὸ δὲ ὡς αἴτιον καὶ κινούν ὃ περιάπτει τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τῇ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ δυνάμει. (26.11–13 Diels). The English translation is adapted from Fortenbaugh, *Theophrastus of Eresus*, vol. 1, 423 (Fr. 230).

²⁰³ H. Dörrie notes that the notion that God, Ideas, and Matter form the triad of First Principles is “Kernsatz des Mittelplatonismus” (Dörrie, *Platonica Minora*, 342 n. 16). It appears in multiple authors, cf., e.g., Apuleius, *On Plato and his Doctrine* I.5 (92 Moerschini); Ps.-Plutarch, *Placita Philosophorum* I.3 (287–288 Diels); Alcinous, *Didaskalikos*, ch. 9 (20 Whittaker [= 162.29–42 Heinsius]).

Socrates, it received original expression by Plato. Plato, however, never used the word ὕλη, which after Aristotle became a standard term for Matter. Rather, Plato preferred descriptive expressions, like the “mother that is receptive to every being”, and the like (§41)²⁰⁴. We find a similar reflection on Plato’s definition of Matter in the *Didaskalikos*, a work dated to the third century AD²⁰⁵:

Plato calls this a “mould”, “all-receiver”, “nurse”, “mother”, and “space”, and a substratum “tangible by non-sensation” and graspable (only) “by a bastard reasoning”. He declares that it has the characteristic of receiving the whole realm of generation by performing the role of a nurse in sustaining it, and receiving all the forms, while of itself remaining without shape, or quality, or form, but it can be moulded and imprinted with such impressions like a mould and shaped by these, having no shape or quality of its own. For nothing would be readily adapted to (receiving) a variety of imprints and shapes unless it were itself devoid of qualities and without participation in those forms which it must itself receive.

Plato’s idea of Matter as being “without shape, quality, and form” (ἄμορφόν ἄποιον καὶ ἀνείδειον) is accepted and analyzed in detail in §§44–49, which thus prove to express the same understanding of Platonic teachings as the *Didaskalikos*.

In §§42–43, the treatise addresses the views of the Stoics, which appear to be closest to those of Plato. However, the author finds it necessary to rule out the Stoic definition of Matter as quality; rather, it may potentially receive qualities. In the course of the argument, the author goes back to the question of the relation between Matter and the four elements and presents Matter as the primary foundation that makes possible the transformation of the four elements into each other (§§50–55).

Here we find the image of the wax and brass that change their form, but maintain their essence, which both Plato and Aristotle employ²⁰⁶. A similar summary of Plato’s notion of Matter (and a similar example) is found in Alcinous’ *Didaskalikos*, which again demonstrates a close parallel to the *PM*²⁰⁷:

204 Cf. Plato, *Tim.* 49a6 (πάσης γενέσεως ὑποδοχή) and 51a5 (μήτηρ καὶ ὑποδοχή).

205 Alcinous, *Didaskalikos* 8.2: Ταύτην τοίνυν ἐκμαγεῖόν τε καὶ πανδεχὲς καὶ τιθήνην καὶ μητέρα καὶ χώραν ὀνομάζει καὶ ὑποκείμενον ἅπτόν τε μετ’ ἀναισθησίας καὶ νόθῳ λογισμῷ ληπτόν· ιδιότητα δ’ ἔχειν τοιαύτην, ὥστε πᾶσαν γένεσιν ὑποδέχεσθαι τιθήνης λόγον ἐπέχουσιν τῷ φέρειν αὐτάς καὶ ἀναδέχεσθαι μὲν αὐτὴν πάντα τὰ εἶδη, αὐτὴν δὲ καθ’ αὐτὴν ἄμορφον τε ὑπάρχειν καὶ ἄποιον καὶ ἀνείδειον, ἀναματτομένην δὲ τὰ τοιαῦτα καὶ ἐκτυπουμένην καθάπερ ἐκμαγεῖον καὶ σχηματιζομένην ὑπὸ τούτων, μηδὲν ἴδιον σχῆμα ἔχουσιν καὶ ποιότητα. Οὐ γὰρ γένοιτ’ ἂν τι εὔπαρεσκευασμένον πρὸς ποικίλας ἐκτυπώσεις καὶ μορφάς, εἰ μὴ ἄποιον αὐτὸ ὑπάρχοι καὶ ἀμέτοχον ἐκείνων τῶν εἰδῶν, ἃ δεῖ αὐτὸ δέξασθαι (19, 21 Whittaker [= 162.29–42 Heinsius]). The English translation is adapted from Dillon, *Alcinous*, 15.

206 Cf. Plato, *Tim.* 50a and Aristotle, *Metaph.* Z 8, 1033a–1033b.

207 Alcinous, *Didaskalikos* 8.3: Προσῆκει δὴ καὶ τῇ πανδεχεῖ ὕλῃ, εἰ μέλλει κατὰ πᾶν δέχεσθαι τὰ εἶδη, τῷ μηδεμίαν αὐτῶν φύσιν ἔχειν ὑποκεῖσθαι, ἀλλ’ ἄποιόν τε εἶναι καὶ ἀνείδειον πρὸς ὑποδοχὴν

It is likewise proper to all-receptive Matter, if it is to receive the forms thoroughly, not to have subsistent in itself any of their nature, but to be without quality or form in order to be the receptacle of the forms. And being such, it will be neither body nor incorporeal, but potentially body, just as we understood the bronze to be potentially a statue, because once it has received the form it will be a statue.

Alcinous' observation that, according to Plato, Matter is "neither body nor incorporeal, but potentially body" forms the contents of the rest of Part 4 of the treatise. Its author, who expresses general sympathy with some Stoic views while rejecting others, in this case seems to devote much energy to refuting the Stoic concept that Matter is corporeal²⁰⁸. In §63, the author applies the characteristic Stoic terminology, which presented Matter as three-dimensional and "having resistance" (Syr. ܕܠܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ = Gr. ἀντίτυπον). These ideas were rejected by Porphyry's teacher Plotinus, but were later restored and refined by the Neo-Platonists (first of all, by Philoponus)²⁰⁹.

A series of arguments demonstrates that Matter is not a body. But neither can it be incorporeal, for in this case it may not become a body. Thus, the author reaches the conclusion that Matter is neither body, nor incorporeal, but rather is potentially body.

These characteristics of Matter in §41 derive from Plato's texts and they appear in the Middle Platonists' exposition of Platonic teachings. Compare, for example, Apuleius' summary in his treatise "On Plato and his Doctrine"²¹⁰:

τῶν εἰδῶν· τοιαύτη δ' οὐσα οὔτε σῶμα ἂν εἴη οὔτε ἀσώματον, δυνάμει δὲ σῶμα, ὥς καὶ τὸν χαλκὸν ὑπακούομεν δυνάμει ἀνδριάντα, διότι τὸ εἶδος δεξάμενος ἀνδριὰς ἔσται. (20 Whittaker [= 163.4–10 Heinsius]). The English translation is adapted from Dillon, *Alcinous*, 15–16.

208 Cf. Ps.-Plutarch, *Placita Philosophorum* I.9.7: Οἱ Στωικοὶ σῶμα τὴν ὕλην ἀποφαίνονται — "Stoics declare matter to be body" (308b.14–15 Diels) = Stobaeus, *Eclogae* I.11.5 (I 133.16 Wachsmuth).

209 For the history of the notion of three-dimensionality, see De Haas, *John Philoponus' New Definition of Prime Matter*.

210 Apuleius, *De Platone et eius dogmate* I.5: *Materiam vero improcreabilem incorruptamque commemorat, non ignem neque aquam nec aliud de principiis et absolutis elementis esse, sed ex omnibus primam, figurarum capacem fictionique subiectam, adhuc rudem et figurationis qualitate viduatam deus artifex conformat universa(m). Infinitam vero idcirco quod ei sit interminata magnitudo. Nam quod infinitum est indistinctam magnitudinis habet finem atque ideo, cum viduata sit fine, infinibilis recte videri potest. Sed neque corpoream nec sane incorpoream concedit esse. Ideo autem non putat corpus, quod omne corpus specie qualicumque non careat; sine corpore vero esse non potest dicere, quod nihil incorporeale corpus exhibeat, sed vi et ratione sibi eam videri corpoream, atque ideo nec (t)actu solo necque tamen sola opinione cogitationis intellegi. Namque corpora propter insignem evidentiam sui simili iudicio cognosci, sed quae substantiam non habent corporum, ea cogitationibus videri. Unde adulterata opinione ambiguam materiae huius intellegi qualitatem.* (92.15–93.17 Moreschini). The English translation is adapted from Boys-Stones, *Platonist Philosophy 80 BC to AD 250*, 93–94.

Ungenerated, imperishable matter is, he (i.e. Plato) notes, neither fire, nor water, nor any other of the primary, composite elements. What the creator moulds into a universe is prime matter — matter which underlies everything, which can take on shapes, and is subject to moulding, but which is yet unformed and unqualified by shape. Matter is infinite, because its size is indeterminate. (What is infinite has no definite boundary to its size, and since matter is devoid of boundaries, it rightly seems boundless.) Plato does not allow that matter is corporeal — or, indeed, incorporeal. He does not think it a body because all bodies have some sort of definition; but on the other hand, matter cannot be said truly to lack body, because nothing incorporeal produces body. Plato thinks, then, that it is potentially and theoretically corporeal. As such, it cannot be understood by touch alone, nor by reasoned judgement alone. Bodies, in line with the particular kind of clarity they have, are understood by a corresponding form of judgement; things that do not have corporeal substance are perceived in thought. The ambiguous nature of matter means that it is grasped by “illegitimate reasoning”.

The reference to “illegitimate reasoning” is a quotation from *Tim.* 52b2, where Plato notes that Matter may only be understood λογισμῷ νόθῳ, a notion that *PM* stresses several times (see §§41, 70).

At the beginning of Part 5 (§§68–73), the author sums up Plato’s view of First Principles and Matter, which he elaborated in the form of coherent logical argument in the previous two parts: According to Plato, Matter is an ungenerated principle, it is unqualified, and body in potentiality. It is receptive to everything and thus may receive qualities, forms, and measures. It is unlimited and has neither beginning nor end.

As the previous exposition demonstrated, *PM* presents the traditional Middle Platonist system of philosophy concerning First Principles and Matter. It is not surprising that in the next section the treatise goes into further details, by quoting several authoritative Middle Platonists, whose arguments the author of the treatise critically analyses.

2.5 Various Interpretations of Plato’s *Timaeus* (Part 5, §§73–97)

Part 5 contains quotations from the earlier philosophers, and these quotations turn out to be of great interest for the history of philosophy. They add not only new evidence for the views of Boethus, Plutarch, Atticus, and Severus, but allow a better understanding of the relation between Porphyry, the disciple of Plotinus and the presumed author of the treatise, and the previous generations of Plato’s commentators.

2.5.1 Atticus

In §§73–83, we encounter a large quotation from the second century head of the Athenian Academy, Atticus²¹¹. It derives from his “first treatise on Plato’s teachings” (ܐܬܬܝܩܘܣܐ ܕܥܡܪܐܬܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ). This reference allows us to assume that the quoted work was a general overview of Platonic philosophy. It is interesting to note that the Syriac text can be interpreted in such a way that the quotation from Atticus begins with words which could be considered a sub-title: ܐܬܬܝܩܘܣܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ — “On First Principles”. Thus, it is possible that the quoted discourse dealt with central issues of Platonic philosophy, presented in several books.

However, no such treatise of Atticus is attested by other authors²¹². Much of what we know about this philosopher derives from Eusebius of Caesarea’s *Praeparatio Evangelica*²¹³, who refers to Atticus’ work written against those who try to interpret Plato through Aristotle²¹⁴. This polemical discourse²¹⁵ was directed against the Peripatetics, and the quotations from it preserved by Eusebius deal with general questions (like the division of philosophy), but mostly focus on ethical issues. It is possible that the “treatise on Plato’s teachings” mentioned in the Syriac text may be the same work of Atticus which was known to Eusebius; however, the latter seems to be mostly focused on the questions of ethics.

It is much more likely that the work in question is Atticus’ commentary on the *Timaeus*, which served as a reference work for Proclus in his commentary on this Platonic dialogue. Additional evidence about Atticus’ philosophy comes from Simplicius’ commentary on the *Categories*, from Philoponus’ *De Aeternitate mundi*, and from some other authors who, like Proclus, most likely had no access to the full works of the philosopher, but mainly derived their information from Porphyry²¹⁶.

In the preserved sources, the views of Atticus are often associated with those of Plutarch, so that the two philosophers appear like some sort of twins²¹⁷, and the same

²¹¹ For Atticus, see Dillon, *Middle Platonists*, 247–258; Baltes, “Zur Philosophie des Platonikers Attikos”; Moreschini, “Attico: Una figura singolare del medioplatonismo”; Whittaker, “Atticus”; Karamanolis, *Plato and Aristotle in Agreement?*, 150–190.

²¹² The extant fragments of Atticus’ works have been published in Des Places, *Atticus. Fragments*.

²¹³ Fragments 1–9 by Édouard des Places (des Places, *Atticus. Fragments*, 38–69).

²¹⁴ Πρὸς τοὺς διὰ τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους τὰ Πλάτωνος ὑπισχνουμένους (Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* XI.1.2, 6.19 Mras & des Places). G. Boys-Stones interprets this title as “Against those who undertake to reconstruct Plato’s doctrines through Aristotle”, see Boys-Stones, *Platonist Philosophy 80 BC to AD 250*, *passim*.

²¹⁵ On the possible historical setting of this polemic, see Dillon, *Middle Platonists*, 249–250.

²¹⁶ Cf. Baltes, *Die Weltentstehung*, vol. 1, 45.

²¹⁷ An expression of M. Baltes: “...Plutarch und Attikos, die wie ein Zwillingsspaar bis in die Spätantike hinein als die Vertreter einer zeitlichen Genese der Welt im *Timaios* gelten” (Baltes, *Die Weltentstehung*, vol. 1, 65).

association is characteristic of *PM*. They are usually mentioned together as the partisans to the idea that the world had a temporal beginning. In *Tim.* 28b, Plato referred to the world as “generated” (γενητόν), a notion which was understood in different ways by his commentators. According to various witnesses, Plutarch and Atticus interpreted Plato’s text so that the world had a beginning in time²¹⁸. Later Platonists (Taurus, Severus, Plotinus, and Porphyry) revised this view, but kept their interest in the ideas of Plutarch and Atticus, who seem to have maintained some influence upon the next generations of Platonic commentators. See, e.g., the following notion of Proclus in his commentary on the *Timaeus*²¹⁹:

Followers of Plutarch of Chaeronea and Atticus persistently cite these words (i.e. *Tim.* 28b) as showing that there was a temporal beginning to the genesis of the cosmos; and they say that unordered matter had prior existence, prior to creation, and that the maleficent soul which was responsible for its chaotic movement also had prior existence. For where does movement come from if not soul?

From Proclus’ words it becomes clear that both Plutarch and Atticus interpreted Plato’s text as asserting that Matter was ungenerated²²⁰ and that its unordered state was due to Soul. The quotation from Atticus attested in *PM* does not dwell on various meanings of the word γενητόν in *Tim.* 28b, but focusses on the same aspect of Plato’s cosmology, which Proclus mentions in relation to Plutarch and Atticus, i.e. the relation of Matter to Soul.

In speaking about First Principles according to Platonic philosophy, Atticus states that they are four in number: God, Forms, Matter, and Soul (§73). Another way of presenting this question would be to combine God and Forms under the category “active cause”, and Matter and Soul under the category “passive cause”, thus reducing the number of principles to two (§74).

A similar outline of Atticus’ concept of First Principles appears in Proclus’ commentary on the *Timaeus*, who explicitly refers to Porphyry as his source. According to

²¹⁸ See Baltes, *Die Weltentstehung*, vol. 1, 28–69.

²¹⁹ Proclus, *In Tim.*: Οἱ μὲν οὖν περὶ Πλούταρχον τὸν Χαίρωνεα καὶ Ἀττικὸν λιπαρῶς ἀντέχονται τούτων τῶν ῥημάτων ὡς τὴν ἀπὸ χρόνου τῷ κόσμῳ γένεσιν αὐτοῖς μαρτυρούντων καὶ δὴ καὶ φασι προεῖναι μὲν τὴν ἀκόσμητον ὕλην πρὸ τῆς γενέσεως, προεῖναι δὲ καὶ τὴν κακεργέτιν ψυχὴν τὴν τοῦτο κινούσαν τὸ πλημμελές· πόθεν γὰρ ἡ κίνησις ἥν ἡ ἀπὸ ψυχῆς; (I 381.26–382.3 Diehl = Fr. 23 des Places). The English translation is adapted from Boys-Stones, *Platonist Philosophy 80 BC to AD 250*, 121.

²²⁰ Cf. Proclus, *In Tim.*: περὶ δὲ τῆς ὕλης αὐτῆς ζητήσκειν ἂν τις, εἴτε ἀγένητός ἐστιν ἀπ’ αἰτίας, ὡς φασιν οἱ περὶ Πλούταρχον καὶ Ἀττικόν, εἴτε γενητή, καὶ ἐκ ποίας αἰτίας (I 384.2–5 Diehl = Fr. 24 des Places) — “Concerning Matter itself, one might ask whether it is created by no cause, as followers of Plutarch and Atticus say, or whether it is created and [if so] by what cause” (Boys-Stones, *Platonist Philosophy 80 BC to AD 250*, 117).

Proclus, Porphyry not only transmitted Atticus' views, but also critically assessed them²²¹:

So, let's come to grips briefly with Porphyry's pious thoughts on these things. He first attacks those followers of Atticus who champion a plurality of mutually conjoined principles — the Creator and the Forms — and who also say that Matter is moved by an ungenerated Soul, an irrational and maleficent one, moved “without measure, without order”; and that Matter exists before the perceptible chronologically, the irrational before reason, and disorder before order.

Proclus' summary of Porphyry's “pious thoughts” concerning Atticus find close parallels in the quotation from the latter preserved in *PM* §§73–83. Here, Atticus argues against those who do not recognize Soul as one of the First Principles in Platonic philosophy. By so doing, he refers to the famous passage in Plato's *Timaeus*²²²:

Desiring, then, that all things should be good and, so far as might be, nothing imperfect, the God took over all that is visible — not at rest, but in discordant and unordered motion — and brought it from disorder into order.

Atticus interpreted these words to mean that Matter, which the Demiurge took over, was “neither unmovable nor unqualified” (§75). As, according to Plato (“Plato demonstrates everywhere”), Soul is a source of all movability, it is clear that Soul should be counted among the First Principles (§76). Introducing the category of Soul allows Atticus to maintain the traditional Platonic notion of Matter as unqualified and incorporeal, but potentially and theoretically corporeal (*contra* Stoic notion that it is a body, see above). For it is due to the activity of Soul that Matter receives not only movability, but also qualities, as Atticus further explains in §82.

In §76, he argues: “If one agrees to call both of them ‘matter’, because Soul and what is properly called Matter were unseparated from each other, then it is clear that

221 Proclus, *In Tim.*: Φέρε δὴ οὖν καὶ ὅσα ὁ φιλόσοφος Πορφύριος ἐν τούτοις ἱεροπρεπῇ νοήματα παραδέδωκε, συντόμως περιλάβωμεν. πρῶτον μὲν οὖν ἀποτείνεται πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Ἀττικὸν πολλὰς ὑποτιθεμένους ἀρχὰς συναπτούσας ἀλλήλοις τὸν δημιουργὸν καὶ τὰς ιδέας, οἱ καὶ τὴν ὕλην ὑπὸ ἀγενήτου φασὶ κινουμένην ψυχῆς, ἀλόγου δὲ καὶ κακεργέτιδος, πλημμελῶς καὶ ἀτάκτως φέρεσθαι, (καὶ) προϋφιστᾶσι κατὰ χρόνον τὴν μὲν ὕλην τοῦ αἰσθητοῦ, τὴν δὲ ἀλογίαν τοῦ λόγου, τὴν δὲ ἀταξίαν τῆς τάξεως. (I 391.4–12 Diehl = Fr. 26 des Places = Fr. 51 Sodano). The English translation is adapted with some modifications from Boys-Stones, *Platonist Philosophy 80 BC to AD 250*, 121. Cf. Michalewski, “Atticus et le nombre des principes”.

222 Plato, *Tim.* 30a2–5: βουλευθεὶς γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἀγαθὰ μὲν πάντα, φλαῦρον δὲ μηδὲν εἶναι κατὰ δύναμιν, οὕτω δὴ πᾶν ὅσον ἦν ὁρατὸν παραλαβὼν οὐχ ἡσυχίαν ἄγον ἀλλὰ κινούμενον πλημμελῶς καὶ ἀτάκτως, εἰς τάξιν αὐτὸ ἤγαγεν ἐκ τῆς ἀταξίας. The English translation is adapted from Cornford, *Plato's Cosmology*, 33.

it is right to speak in this way about three Principles”. It becomes clear from Atticus’ words that the notion of Soul as one of the principles plays a rather instrumental role, which allows him to maintain the classical Platonic idea of Matter as incorporeal and unqualified without destroying the traditional triad of Principles.

In the paragraphs that follow the quotation (§§84–86), the author of the treatise, i.e. Porphyry, stresses that Plutarch and Atticus agree in stating that Soul exists from eternity and that it is eternally associated with Matter. In §86, the author criticizes the views of the two philosophers. In so doing, he suggests differentiating between the generation of the world and the generation of primary bodies, an argument which John Philoponus and Proclus explicitly ascribe to Porphyry (for details, see 2.6, below). This paragraph of the Syriac text leaves little doubt that its Greek prototype derives from Plotinus’ disciple, who not only polemicised against the views of Plutarch and Atticus, but also carefully transmitted them in his writings.

It is worth noting that the view of Plutarch and Atticus that the world had a temporal beginning was naturally close to the Christian authors who were eager to refer to them, arguing against those philosophers who defended the eternity of the world. Thus, the Christian polemicist Aeneas, who lived in Gaza in the late fifth to the beginning of the sixth century, refers to Atticus in his polemical treatise *Theophrastus* in the following way²²³:

The great Atticus, Plato’s lover, expounding his beloved’s views, said somewhere that he was seeking the nature and order of the universe, and, being such as it is, it was not ungenerated or eternal, but created by one greater in power and more perfect, the oldest God, the intelligible God: for, being visible, tangible and in every way corporeal it was impossible for it to be ungenerated. How can we not admit that things whose being needs the help of something else to ensure their existence have come into being and are preserved by their maker? He calls Aristotle ridiculous, because he admits on the one hand that this world is visible, tangible and corporeal, but contends strongly that it is ungenerated and indestructible.

223 Aeneas of Gaza, *Theophrastus*: Ὁ δὲ πολὺς Ἀττικὸς, ὁ τοῦ Πλάτωνος ἐραστής, τὰ τῷ ἐρωμένῳ δοκοῦντα διεξιὼν, ἔφη πού τοῦ κόσμου τὴν φύσιν καὶ τάξιν ἐπιζητεῖν, τοιοῦτον δ’ αὐτὸν ὄντα οὐκ ἀγέννητον οὐδ’ αἰδίων εἶναι, ἀλλ’ ὑπὸ τοῦ μείζονος τὴν δύναμιν καὶ τελειοτέρου, Θεοῦ τοῦ πρεσβυτάτου καὶ νοητοῦ γεγονέναι· ὁρατὸν γάρ ὄντα καὶ ἄπτὸν καὶ πάντῃ σωματοειδῇ, ἀμήχανον ἦν ἀγέννητον εἶναι· ὧν γὰρ ἡ οὐσία βοηθείας δεῖται τῆς παρ’ ἐτέρου πρὸς τὸ εἶναι. Πῶς ταῦτα μὴ ὁμολογοῦμεν γεγονέναι τε καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ ποιήσαντος διασώζεσθαι; Τὸν δὲ Ἀριστοτέλη καὶ γελοῖον ἀποκαλεῖ, ὁμολογοῦντα μὲν τόδε τὸ πᾶν ὁρατὸν εἶναι καὶ ἄπτὸν καὶ σωματοειδές, ἀγέννητον δὲ καὶ ἄφθαρτον εἶναι φιλονεικοῦντα. (46.16–47.2 Colonna). English translation is adapted from Gertz et al., *Aeneas of Gaza. Theophrastus*, 40–41.

The ideas of Atticus (and Plutarch) were praised by the later contemporary of Aeneas, John Philoponus, who shared the same apologetic bias and opposed the views of Atticus to those of Proclus in *Contra Proclum*²²⁴. It is thus not unlikely that the name of Atticus, who came for the Christian readers to be associated with the idea of the temporal beginning of the world, served as the basis for transmitting *PM* until the time when it became known to the Syriac Hellenophiles of the monastery of Qenneshre.

2.5.2 Severus

In criticizing the views of Plutarch and Atticus, the author of the treatise turns to the authority of another Platonist, Severus. Not much is known of this philosopher, who was probably active in Athens in the second century²²⁵. Proclus mentions his name several times in his commentary on the *Timaeus*, and his knowledge of Severus' views most probably derives from Porphyry. The latter became familiar with them during his study with Plotinus, who, according to Porphyry's biography of his teacher, read Severus' works, together with those of Atticus, with his students²²⁶. In his account, Porphyry puts the name of Severus as the first in the line of the authoritative writings read by Plotinus, and this may be interpreted as a chronological arrangement, which thus sets Severus before Atticus, though we have no further evidence for that.

Severus is credited with a commentary on Plato's *Timaeus*²²⁷ and a treatise *On the Soul*²²⁸. Proclus puts Severus in line with Plutarch and Atticus²²⁹, however he notes that Severus' interpretation of Plato's account of the generation of the world differed in certain details from the views of Plutarch and Atticus. This notion is corroborated by the witness of *PM*, whose author contrasted Severus' views with the the interpretation of the two other commentators. According to Proclus, Severus maintained the

²²⁴ Fragments 38a–39 by des Places.

²²⁵ For Severus, see Dillon, *Middle Platonists*, 262–264; Goulet, “Severus”. The extant fragments from Severus' works were edited by Adriano Gioè: Gioè, “Il medioplatonico Severo”. See also Gioè, *Filosofì Medioplatonici*, 377–433.

²²⁶ See Porphyry, *Vita Plotini* 14.10–12: Ἐν δὲ ταῖς συνουσίαις ἀνεγινώσκετο μὲν αὐτῷ τὰ ὑπομνήματα, εἴτε Σεβήρου εἴη, εἴτε Κρονίου ἢ Νουμηνίου ἢ Γαίου ἢ Ἀττικοῦ (19.10–12 Henry & Schwyzler).

²²⁷ Cf. Proclus, *In Tim.*, I 204.17–18 Diehl = Test. 3 (422 Gioè).

²²⁸ Cf. Eusebius, *Preparatio Evangelica* XIII.17.1–7 (239.9–240.16 Mras & des Places) = Fr. 1 (428–429 Gioè).

²²⁹ Proclus, *In Tim.*: εἰ παρ' ἑαυτῶν μὲν λυτά ἐστι, κατὰ δὲ τὴν βούλησιν ἅλντα τοῦ πατρός, ὥσπερ εἰώθασιν λέγειν Σευήρος Ἀττικὸς Πλούταρχος, πρὸς οὓς καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ Περιπάτου πολλὰ διὰ πολλῶν ἀντειρήκασι, πόθεν ἔχει τοῦτο τὸ παρ' ἑαυτῶν λυτόν; (III 212.8–9 Diehl = Test. 8 [424 Gioè]) — “If things are dissoluble in themselves, but indissoluble by the will of the father, as Severus, Atticus and Plutarch used to say (to many and various objections from members of the Peripatos), how do they come to be dissoluble in themselves?” (Boys-Stones, *Platonist Philosophy 80 BC to AD 250*, 201).

temporal beginning of the world, though he suggested further points for understanding the Platonic text²³⁰:

After this view, we should examine Severus, who says that the cosmos simpliciter is sempiternal, but that this present cosmos, moving in the way that is, was generated. For there are two cycles, as the Eleatic Stranger showed: the one which the universe presently follows, and its opposite. So the cosmos is generated and had a beginning insofar as it is revolving in this cycle; simpliciter, though, it is not generated.

The quotation from Severus that appears in §§88–93 derives most certainly from his lost commentary on the *Timaeus*. Unfortunately, similar to the case of Atticus, the reference to the work of Severus is probably corrupt. It runs as follows: ἡ πρώτη πραγματεία περὶ τὰς ἀποφαινομένων — “in the first treatise concerning those things, which Plato did for Timotheos”. The proper name at the end is a corruption of ἡ πρώτη πραγματεία, the form which was probably not familiar to the copyist of ms. DS 27, but which has been preserved correctly in Barhebraeus’ text²³¹.

The passage quoted in *PM* deals with that part of the Platonic dialogue which runs “from the beginning of the passage on nature until that one which is called ‘generation of Soul’”, i.e. *Tim.* 31c–36d. If we take into account Proclus’ remark²³² that Severus left the introductory part of the dialogue out of his commentary, it seems probable that Severus’ work did not embrace the whole text of the *Timaeus*, and that one part of it (the first book?) was focused on Plato’s cosmology and the World Soul.

In the passage quoted in *PM*, Severus defends an understanding of the Platonic text to the effect that the four natural bodies (i.e. elements) existed prior to the creation of the world and Matter and that they were initially moving in an unordered manner. This last characteristic of the state of the four elements before the introduction of order by the Demiurge turns out to be Severus’ prime concern in the quoted passage. The philosopher suggests several philological observations that aim at clarifying the term ἄτακτος, “unordered”, by Plato. Severus interprets the privative prefix “un-” (ἀ-) not as something contrary but rather “that which is intermediate to the extremes”, i.e. what has not yet acquired the ability which it may possess. Thus, a bunch of plants

²³⁰ Proclus, *In Tim.*: μετὰ δὲ ταύτην τὴν δόξαν ἐπισκεψώμεθα Σευήρον, ὃς φησιν ἀπλῶς μὲν αἰδίων εἶναι τὸν κόσμον, τοῦτον δὲ τὸν νῦν ὄντα καὶ οὕτως κινούμενον γενητόν· ἀνακυκλήσεις γὰρ εἶναι διττάς, ὡς ἔδειξεν ὁ Ἐλεάτης ξένος, τὴν μὲν ἥν νυνὶ περιπορεύεται τὸ πᾶν, τὴν δὲ ἐναντίαν· γενητὸς οὖν ὁ κόσμος καὶ ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς ἥρξατό τις ὁ ταύτην τὴν ἀνακύκλησιν ἀνακυκλούμενος, ἀπλῶς δὲ οὐ γενητός. (I 289.6–13 Diehl = Test. 6 [423 Gioè]). The English translation is adapted from Boys-Stones, *Platonist Philosophy 80 BC to AD 250*, 201.

²³¹ See Bakoš, *Le candélabre du sanctuaire*, 546.11.

²³² Proclus, *In Tim.*, I 224.17 Diehl.

which has not yet been planted in a particular order may be called “unordered” because they have not yet acquired the state of order which will be established after they have been planted (§92). This analogy, according to Severus, serves as an explanation of the state of the four primary bodies.

It turns out that Severus' method was much more philological than philosophical. Plotinus, who, according to §95, agreed with Severus' treatment of this passage, ascribed the same philological tendency to Longinus, another Middle Platonist who *PM* refers to.

2.5.3 Longinus and Boethus

The figure of Longinus²³³ appears only briefly in *PM*, but nevertheless, it plays a special role for its author, who calls Longinus (together with Plotinus) his teacher. These references make evident that the Syriac text ultimately derives from Porphyry (see the next section). In *Vita Plotini*, Porphyry writes that, when Plotinus had two of Longinus' treatises read to him, he remarked: “Longinus is a philologist, no philosopher at all”²³⁴. Similarly, Proclus calls him ὁ κριτικός, who dealt with the Platonic text primarily from the philological perspective²³⁵.

This characteristic which Plotinus attributed to Longinus, according to Porphyry's account, was addressed to a contemporary and to another teacher of the latter. Porphyry maintained a close connection with his former tutor and kept up a correspondence with him²³⁶. In *Vita Plotini*, Porphyry quotes one of these letters, in which Longinus expresses great interest in Plotinus' writings and asked his former disciple to send him better copies of them²³⁷. Porphyry further characterizes Longinus as κριτικώτατος²³⁸, which reminds us of Proclus' notion, and quotes a polemical treatise of Longinus against Plotinus and his disciple Amelius that bore the title Περὶ τέλους.

²³³ For Longinus and his legacy, see Brisson & Patillon, “Longinus Platonicus Philosophus et Philologus”; Männlein-Robert, *Longin, Philologe und Philosoph*.

²³⁴ Porphyry, *Vita Plotini* 14.18–20: Ἀναγνωσθέντος δὲ αὐτῷ τοῦ τε «Περὶ ἀρχῶν» Λογγίνου καὶ τοῦ «Φιλαρχαίου», «φιλόλογος μὲν», ἔφη, «ὁ Λογγῖνος, φιλόσοφος δὲ οὐδαμῶς» (19–20 Henry & Schwyzer).

²³⁵ Proclus, *In Tim.*: Λογγῖνος μὲν ὁ κριτικός, ἐφιστὰς τῇ ῥήσει ταύτῃ φιλολόγως ... (I 14.7–8 Diehl).

²³⁶ For the relation of Longinus to his disciple, see Männlein-Robert, *Longin, Philologe und Philosoph*, 90–91.

²³⁷ Porphyry, *Vita Plotini* 19 (25–26 Henry & Schwyzer).

²³⁸ Porphyry, *Vita Plotini* 20.1–5: Ταῦτα ἐπιπλέον παρατέθεικα τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς κριτικώτατου γενομένου καὶ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων σχεδὸν πάντα τῶν καθ' αὐτὸν διελέξαντος δεικνὺς οἷα γέγονεν ἡ περὶ Πλωτίνου κρίσις. (26 Henry & Schwyzer) — “I have cited these remarks at length to illustrate how Plotinus was judged by the foremost critic of our time, one who was rigorous in his strictures on almost all his other contemporaries” (Edwards, *Neoplatonic Saints*, 35).

Porphry's account of Plotinus' teaching practice includes references to Longinus' two treatises, *Περὶ ἀρχῶν* and *Φιλαρχαίος*. Proclus' references to Longinus in his commentary on the *Timaeus* make probable that Longinus had composed a commentary of his own on this Platonic dialogue²³⁹, one which was known to Porphyry and in this way was transmitted to Proclus. Thus, while referring to the views of Longinus, the author of *PM* could have had in mind some of the written treatises of this philosopher, or he could have based his words on first-hand knowledge.

Proclus writes that Porphyry was eager not only to quote his teacher, but also to criticize his views, e.g. in the question of the relation of First Forms to Demiurge, in which Longinus' ideas differed from those of his disciple. Proclus notes²⁴⁰:

Among the ancients, some made the Demiurge himself contain the paradigms of wholes, as Plotinus; others thought that the paradigm was not the Demiurge, but something prior to him or posterior to him — prior to him, like Porphyry; posterior to him, like Longinus.

§95 of *PM* not only opposes the positions of Porphyry's teachers, Plotinus and Longinus, but also claims that the latter derived his views from the earlier philosopher Boethus²⁴¹, who comes as the last authority in *PM*. Longinus' interest in Boethus' writings was probably the reason Porphyry was well acquainted with them and even found it necessary to compose a treatise *Περὶ ψυχῆς πρὸς Βόηθον*, which according to the *Suda* contained five books, i.e. was a voluminous work²⁴². It was known to Eusebius, who included large quotations from it in the *Praeparatio Evangelica*²⁴³. The object of Porphyry's polemic in this treatise might have been the Peripatetic Boethus of Sidon (2nd century BC)²⁴⁴. However, it is also possible that both in the treatise *On*

²³⁹ Cf. Männlein-Robert, *Longin, Philologe und Philosoph*, 36–38.

²⁴⁰ Proclus, *In Tim.*: ἐπεὶ γὰρ τῶν παλαιῶν οἱ μὲν αὐτὸν τὸν δημιουργὸν ἐποίησαν ἔχοντα τὰ παραδείγματα τῶν ὅλων, ὡς Πλωτίνος, οἱ δὲ οὐκ αὐτόν, ἀλλ' ἤτοι πρὸ αὐτοῦ τὸ παράδειγμα, ἢ μετ' αὐτόν, πρὸ αὐτοῦ μὲν ὡς ὁ Πορφύριος, μετ' αὐτόν δὲ ὡς ὁ Λογγίνος (I 322.20–24 Diehl). The English translation is adapted from Boys-Stones, *Platonist Philosophy 80 BC to AD 250*, 178.

²⁴¹ For various philosophers bearing this name, see Wissowa, *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie*, vol. 5, 601–607; Goulet, *Dictionnaire*, vol. 2, 122–132 (B42–49).

²⁴² *Περὶ ψυχῆς πρὸς Βόηθον* ε' (*Suda* 2098, IV 178.20 Adler). See Dillon, "Boëthos". Wilhelm Kutsch published a fragment from a treatise *On the Soul* preserved in Arabic as a work of Porphyry: Kutsch, "Ein arabisches Bruchstück". It is unlikely that this fragment derives from the *Περὶ ψυχῆς πρὸς Βόηθον*; rather, it stands in the tradition of the so-called "Theology of Aristotle".

²⁴³ Eusebius, *Preparatio Evangelica* XI.27–28; XIV.10.3; XV.10–11; XV.15–16 (II 62.25–65.18, 287.1–7, 373.23–375.4, 380.18–381.7 Mras & des Places = Fr. 242–250 Smith).

²⁴⁴ See Gottschalk, "Boethus' Psychology and the Neoplatonists"; Trabattini, "Boëthos de Sidon et l'immortalité de l'âme".

the *Soul* and in the *PM* Porphyry was addressing the Platonic lexicographer bearing the same name, who apparently lived in the second century AD²⁴⁵.

The preserved fragments from *Περὶ ψυχῆς πρὸς Βόηθον* focus mainly on the question of the immortality of the soul, considered in connection with Plato's *Phaedo*²⁴⁶. The short quotation from Boethus in *PM* does not deal directly with Soul, but the absence of this topic from the quoted passage may be interpreted as a deliberate tactic of Boethus. In §§96–97, namely, Boethus states that Matter must possess some sort of movability of its own. Given that this statement appears after the long quotation from Atticus, who believed that Soul is the source of any movability, including that of Matter, while quoting Boethus Porphyry was purporting to give a counter-argument.

In one of the quotations preserved by Eusebius, Porphyry accuses some unnamed opponents of assigning the properties of physical bodies to Soul²⁴⁷:

But to liken the soul to weight or (any other) simple and unmoved qualities of bodies, is the notion of someone, who willingly or unwillingly, has completely failed to understand the dignity of the soul and has not seen that the body of the animal has become alive because of the presence of the soul.

Though Porphyry's critique as recorded by Eusebius is anonymous, the last paragraphs of *PM* make apparent that it could be Boethus and those who shared his ideas whom Plotinus' disciple could have had in mind²⁴⁸. The argument, which becomes the object of criticism by Porphyry, appears in *PM* §96, where Boethus turns to the image of a stone, which may be thrown up, but eventually always falls down. These parallels make it quite likely that the philosopher whom Porphyry addressed in his polemical treatise *On the Soul*, and the one whose words appear at the end of *PM*, was the same person.

²⁴⁵ See Dyck, "Notes"; Auffret, "La doctrine de l'âme".

²⁴⁶ According to Gottschalk ("Boethus' Psychology and the Neoplatonists", 253), it could be Alexander of Aphrodisias, whom Porphyry had in mind.

²⁴⁷ Eusebius, *Preparatio Evangelica* XV.11.2: Τὸ δὲ βαρύτητι ἀπεικάζειν τὴν ψυχὴν ἢ ποιότησι μονοειδέσι καὶ ἀκινήτοις σωματικαῖς, καθ' ἃς ἡ κινεῖται ἢ ποιόν ἐστι τὸ ὑποκείμενον, ἐκπεπτωκότος ἦν τέλεον ἢ ἐκόντος ἢ ἄκοντος τῆς ψυχικῆς ἀξίας καὶ οὐδαμῶς καθεωρακότος ὡς παρούσα μὲν τῆς ψυχῆς ζωτικὸν γέγονε τὸ τοῦ ζώου σῶμα (374.9–12 Mras & des Places = Fr. 248 Smith). The English translation is adapted from Gottschalk, "Boethus' Psychology and the Neoplatonists", 250.

²⁴⁸ See Gottschalk, "Boethus' Psychology and the Neoplatonists", 244–245.

transmitted as a separate treatise in a number of Syriac manuscripts, providing Syrian readers with a short introduction in the quadrivium²⁵⁷. The Syriac scholia to the *Isagoge* serve as evidence of the role of this text in Syriac education, and present its author as an authority, not only in logic, but also in the history of sciences.

Porphry's lost work *Philosophos historia* must also have been known to Syrian scholars, as it left traces in Theodore Bar Koni's *Book of Scholia*²⁵⁸. The parables that were included by Porphyry in the *Life of Pythagoras*, the only extant part of his *Philosophos historia*, were transmitted in Syriac in various forms as part of the corpus of sayings of Pythagoras²⁵⁹.

The tenth-century Baghdad bookseller Ibn al-Nadim wrote in his *Catalogue* (*Fihrist*) that he was aware of a number of translations of Porphyry's works into Syriac²⁶⁰. Thus, he reported that he had seen a Syriac version of the fourth part of Porphyry's *Book of Histories of the Philosophers* (i.e. of his *Philosophos historia*), which was probably devoted to the life and teachings of Plato²⁶¹. Additionally, Ibn al-Nadim testifies to the existence of the Syriac version of Porphyry's otherwise unknown *Book of the Elements* that contained only one part²⁶². Thus, the name and the writings of Porphyry must have been familiar to the learned Syrians not only due to the famous *Isagoge*, but also due to his treatises on the history of philosophy and on physics.

This evidence makes it rather unlikely that Porphyry's name was intentionally deleted from the title of the treatise due to a negative attitude towards him. Rather, it must have fallen victim to the loss of the introductory part of the text and of its title that had taken place already at the initial stage of transmission. This fact is attested as early as the end of the eighth century by the letter of Timothy I, who clearly stated in his description that in his time the treatise had no title, so that he had to quote it by the opening lines, which remained the same in ms. DS 27.

In establishing the lost title of the Greek work which underlines *PM*, we are confined to the internal witness of the Syriac version. A possible hint appears in §17, where the author thus defines the contents of his work:

²⁵⁷ Mss. Berlin, Petermann I 9 (Sachau 88), fols. 180r–v; Cambridge Add. 2812, fol. 107r; Alqosh, Chaldean Diocese, Syr. 61, fol. 242r–v. See Sachau, *Verzeichniss der syrischen Handschriften*, vol. 1, 331; Wright, *A Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts Preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge*, vol. 1, 640–641; Arzhanov & Kessel, “A Previously Unknown Philosophical Manuscript from Alqosh”.

²⁵⁸ Cf. Baumstark, “Griechische Philosophen und ihre Lehren”.

²⁵⁹ For the corpus of sayings of Pythagoras and the Pythagoreans in Syriac, see Arzhanov, *Syriac Sayings of Greek Philosophers*, 84–90.

²⁶⁰ Flügel, *Kitāb al-Fihrist*, vol. 1, 253 (فروريوس). The account of Ibn al-Nadim was borrowed by al-Qiftī in the *Ta'riḥ al-Ḥukamā'* (Lippert, *Ibn al-Qiftī*, 256–257) and by Barhebraeus in the *Ta'riḥ muḥtaṣar al-duwal* (Ṣāliḥānī, *Abū l-Ḥaṣṣaḥ Ḡriḡūriyūs Ibn al-'Ibrī*, 132–133).

²⁶¹ كتاب اخبار الفلاسفة ورأيت منه المكالة الرابعة سرياني — “The Book of the Histories of the Philosophers. I have seen its fourth part in Syriac”.

²⁶² كتاب الاسطقسات مقالة سرياني — “The Book of the Elements. One Part. In Syriac”.

As our discourse is about principles, prior to which nothing may be thought, we employ the initial type of the demonstrative science.

Based on this passage, we may assume that the original title of Porphyry's work may have been *Περὶ ἀρχῶν*. The lexicon of Suda provides us with a notion that Porphyry indeed composed a treatise with this title and that it included two books or parts²⁶³. Proclus thus refers to this work in his *Platonic Theology*²⁶⁴:

But, after him (i.e. Plotinus), Porphyry in his treatise *On Principles*, demonstrates by many and beautiful arguments that Intellect is eternal, but that, at the same time, it contains in itself (something prior to the eternal), through which it is conjoined with the One (for the One is above all eternity). For the eternal has a second, or rather third order in it (i.e. in Intellect).

This passage presents Porphyry as a true disciple of Plotinus and contains a summary of the text, which may also reflect Proclus' interpretation of Porphyry's thought²⁶⁵. This witness does not match the contents of the piece preserved in ms. DS 27. This might be explained by an assumption that the Syriac version of *PM* is only a fragment of a larger treatise that originally contained two books. However, another assumption seems to be more likely, namely, that *PM* goes back to a discourse which was focused not on the Plotinus' teachings primarily, but rather on the Platonic notion of Matter, which forms the larger part of the content of *PM*.

It is interesting to note that the next title listed by the Suda in the list of Porphyry's writings is the treatise *Περὶ ὕλης*, which contained six books or parts²⁶⁶. An extensive quotation from this work appears in Simplicius' commentary on Aristotle's *Physics*²⁶⁷:

²⁶³ *Περὶ ἀρχῶν β'* (Suda 2098, IV 178.19 Adler). Cf. Dörrie & Baltes, *Der Platonismus im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert nach Christus: Bausteine 73–100*, 282–285.

²⁶⁴ Proclus, *Theol. Plat.* I.11: Πορφύριος δὲ αὖ μετὰ τοῦτον ἐν τῇ Περὶ ἀρχῶν πραγματείᾳ τὸν νοῦν εἶναι μὲν αἰώνιον ἐν πολλοῖς καὶ καλοῖς ἀποδείκνυσιν λόγοις, ἔχειν δὲ ὅμως ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ προαιώνιον (τι καὶ τὸ μὲν προαιώνιον) τοῦ νοῦ τῷ ἐνὶ συνάπτειν (ἐκεῖνο γὰρ ἦν ἐπέκεινα παντὸς αἰῶνος) τὸ δὲ αἰώνιον δευτέραν ἔχειν, μᾶλλον δὲ τρίτην ἐν ἐκείνῳ τάξιν· (51.4–11 Saffrey & Westerink = Fr. 232 Smith). For the English translation, cf. Taylor, *Proclus' Theology of Plato*, 79.

²⁶⁵ Cf. Smith, *Porphyry's Place in the Neoplatonic Tradition*, 112, n. 2; Rist, "Mysticism and Transcendence in Later Neoplatonism". Hadot found parallels to the summary of Porphyry's views in an anonymous commentary on the *Parmenides* (ed. in Kroll, "Ein neuplatonischer Parmenidescommentar"), which he attributed to Porphyry: Hadot, "Fragments d'un commentaire de Porphyre sur le Parménide".

²⁶⁶ *Περὶ ὕλης ζ'* (Suda 2098, IV 178.19 Adler).

²⁶⁷ Simplicius, *In Arist. Phys.* I 7, 191a7: καὶ ταῦτα δὲ ὁ Πορφύριος ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ Περὶ ὕλης τὰ τοῦ Μοδεράτου παρατιθέμενος γέγραφεν ὅτι "βουλευθεὶς ὁ ἐνιαῖος λόγος, ὥς πού φησιν ὁ Πλάτων, τὴν γένεσιν ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ τῶν ὄντων συστήσασθαι, κατὰ στέρησιν αὐτοῦ ἐχώρησε τὴν ποσότητα πάντων αὐτὴν στέρησας τῶν αὐτοῦ λόγων καὶ εἰδῶν. τοῦτο δὲ ποσότητα ἐκάλεσεν ἄμορφον καὶ ἀδιαίρετον

Porphyry, who sets out these views of Moderatus in the second book of *On Matter*, has written that “As Plato says somewhere, the unified *logos*, wanting to bring about the coming to be of things from itself, found room for the quantity of all things by privation of itself, depriving quantity of its own *logoi* and forms. He called this thing formless, indivisible, and shapeless quantity, but (said it is) receptive of form, shape, division, quality, everything of this kind. He says that Plato seems to have predicated many words of this quantity, ‘omnirecipient’ and ‘formless’ and ‘invisible’, and said it shares in a most perplexing way in the intelligible and is barely graspable by a bastard reasoning and all sorts of things like this. He says that this quantity and this form, which is understood by privation of the unified *logos* which embraces all the *logoi* of existing things in itself, are paradigms of the matter of bodies, which itself, he said, was also called quantity by the Pythagoreans and Plato, not quantity as form but quantity which is derived from privation and loosening and extending and spreading out (and exists) because of deviation from being, for which reason matter is also thought to be evil since it flees away from the good. And it is apprehended by it (the good) and is not allowed to escape determination, its extension receiving the *logos* of eidetic magnitude and being determined by it, its spreading-out being given form by numerical discrimination.”

This exposition taken from Porphyry’s *Περὶ ὕλης* brings forth a number of ideas that Porphyry, like most other Platonists, would express while speaking about the Platonic notion of Matter. *PM* contains the same characteristics of Matter based on the *Timaeus*, which are listed in the quotation above. This quotation, however, does not provide us with much information about Porphyry’s own opinion, for it informs us about the views of Moderatus of Gades, who stated that Plato’s “receptacle”, i.e. Matter, was bad and was a source of evil in the world. This idea was taken as early as Aristotle, who considered Plato’s receptacle maleficent²⁶⁸, and was later adopted by

καὶ ἀσχημάτιστον, ἐπιδεχομένην μέντοι μορφὴν σχῆμα διαίρεσιν ποιότητα πᾶν τὸ τοιοῦτον. ἐπὶ ταύτης ἔοικε, φησί, τῆς ποσότητος ὁ Πλάτων τὰ πλείω ὀνόματα κατηγορῆσαι “πανδεχὴ” καὶ ἀνείδεον λέγων καὶ “ἀόρατον” καὶ “ἀπορώτατα τοῦ νοητοῦ μετειληφέναι” αὐτὴν καὶ “λογισμῷ νόθῳ μόλις ληπτὴν” καὶ πᾶν τὸ τούτοις ἐμμερές. αὕτη δὲ ἡ ποσότης, φησί, καὶ τοῦτο τὸ εἶδος τὸ κατὰ στέρησιν τοῦ ἐνιαίου λόγου νοούμενον τοῦ πάντας τοὺς λόγους τῶν ὄντων ἐν ἑαυτῷ περιειληφότος παραδείγματά ἐστι τῆς τῶν σωμάτων ὕλης, ἣν καὶ αὐτὴν ποσὸν καὶ τοὺς Πυθαγορείους καὶ τὸν Πλάτωνα καλεῖν ἔλεγεν, οὐ τὸ ὡς εἶδος ποσόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ κατὰ στέρησιν καὶ παράλυσιν καὶ ἔκτασιν καὶ διασπασμόν καὶ διὰ τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄντος παράλλαξιν, δι’ ἃ καὶ κακὸν δοκεῖ ἡ ὕλη ὡς τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἀποφεύγουσα. καὶ καταλαμβάνεται ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξελεῖν τῶν ὄρων οὐ συγχωρεῖται, τῆς μὲν ἐκτάσεως τὸν τοῦ εἰδητικοῦ μεγέθους λόγον ἐπιδεχομένης καὶ τούτῳ ὀριζομένης, τοῦ δὲ διασπασμοῦ τῇ ἀριθμητικῇ διακρίσει εἰδοποιουμένου”. (231.5–24 Diels = Fr. 236 Smith). The English translation is adapted with some modifications from Baltussen et al., *Simplicius. On Aristotle Physics 1.5–9*, 113.

268 Arist. *Phys.* I 9, 192a15 (κακοποιόν).

Moderatus and a number of Platonists, among others by Porphyry's teacher Plotinus²⁶⁹. However, having referred to the views of Moderatus, Porphyry has not explicitly supported them. His interest in them turns out to be rather that of a historian of philosophy than of a promoter of particular views.

The interpretation of Porphyry's philosophy at present faces the fact that much of his written heritage is lost. This is particularly sad in the case of his commentary on Plato's *Timaeus*, which must have been a rather voluminous work²⁷⁰. This commentary became a source of knowledge about other philosophers for later generations of scholars. Philoponus points out²⁷¹ that Proclus took the greatest part of his commentary on the *Timaeus* from Porphyry's work with the same title²⁷². This is particularly apparent in Proclus's analysis of *Tim.* 30a3–6, where he explicitly stated that the whole passage was based on Porphyry's work, which was paraphrased in a concise manner²⁷³. This part of Proclus' commentary starts with an exposition of the ideas of Plutarch and Atticus on the temporal beginning of the cosmos and ends with a summary of Porphyry's (originally very detailed²⁷⁴) refutation of the views of his predecessors. Proclus' summary, which was partly quoted above (see 2.5.1), contains the same arguments, which we find in the concluding, fifth, part of *PM*. But in contrast to Proclus, the preserved Syriac version contains not summaries of the views of earlier philosophers, but direct quotations from their works.

It is not always possible to determine the attitude of Porphyry to the arguments of other philosophers, which he carefully transmitted. Porphyry's method in elaborating philosophical topics apparently included an extensive presentation of the views of other philosophers, among which he was not eager to take part quickly. Instead, he pondered and proved various interpretations, some of which he himself was ready to adopt and some to refute²⁷⁵. This method resulted in the active use of doxographical sources, and we find this also in *PM*, which includes a taxonomy of the

269 See O'Brien, "Plotinus on Matter and Evil".

270 Though the full text of the commentary has not come down to us, a large number of quotations from it have been preserved by other late ancient and early medieval authors. They were collected in Sodano, *Porphyrii In Platonis Timaeum Commentariorum Fragmenta*. Additional fragment: 172 Smith.

271 Philoponus, *Contra Proclum* VI.2 (126.10–16 Rabe).

272 Cf. Baltes, *Die Weltentstehung*, vol. 1, ix: "Man kann sagen, dass die Geschichte der Frage nach der Weltentstehung bis zu Proklos hin durch Porphyrios bestimmt ist". David Runia and Michael Share stress that particularly Book 2 of Proclus' commentary is based on Porphyry's work: "By means of his commentary Porphyry placed the interpretation of the *Timaeus* on a new footing and it is only a slight exaggeration to say that Proclus is indebted to it on almost every page" (Runia & Share, *Proclus. Commentary on Plato's Timaeus*, vol. 2, 10).

273 Proclus, *In Tim.*: Φέρει δὴ οὖν καὶ ὅσα ὁ φιλόσοφος Πορφύριος ἐν τούτοις ἱεροπρεπῆ νοήματα παραδέδωκε, συντόμως περιλάβωμεν (I 391.4–6 Diehl).

274 Proclus sums up four chapters (κεφάλαια) of Porphyry's work that were dedicated specifically to the ideas of Plutarch and Atticus (see Proclus, *In Tim.* I 393.14, 393.31, 395.10 Diehl).

275 Cf. Baltes, *Die Weltentstehung*, vol. 1, 163f, 201f.

views of natural philosophers on First Principles in Part 1²⁷⁶ and a series of quotations from the Middle Platonists in Part 5.

The references to Longinus and to Plotinus at the end of the treatise (§95) reveal the educational background of its author and point clearly to Porphyry, who first studied with Longinus in Athens and later in Rome with Plotinus. The author's training explains also the appearance of the names of Atticus, Severus and Boethus. As we read in Porphyry's *Life of Plotinus*, his teacher used to read the works of Atticus and Severus together with his pupils²⁷⁷. Porphyry's interest in Boethus' philosophy, a quotation from whom comes at the end of the Syriac text (§§96–97), was great enough that, according to the Suda, he composed a treatise *On the Soul* addressed to Boethus and comprising five books²⁷⁸. Thus, the *PM* preserved in Syriac translation turns out to be a further witness not only to the Middle Platonist commentaries on Plato's *Timaeus*, but also to the role of Porphyry in the transmission of these texts.

The second and third parts of the treatise focused on introductory issues (§§17–39) reveal to us a masterful teacher of logical questions, whom we know from the *Introduction* to Aristotle's *Categories*, the famous *Isagoge* (in §58, we read about “the first genera of categories” that constitute natural bodies: substance, quantity, qualification, etc.). In the second part of *PM* (§§17–28), the author appears as a Platonist, who expresses Platonic philosophy by means of Aristotle's logic and natural philosophy. The tendency to combine both traditions was characteristic of the Neo-Platonic period, starting with Porphyry, who was interested in both Plato and Aristotle and wrote a book on the agreement between the two philosophers²⁷⁹.

According to Simplicius, Porphyry believed that it was not the task of a scientist to inquire into the question of the First Principles of natural bodies, for they are already given to him. Thus, neither a geometer nor a doctor search for their respective first principles, but take them for granted. Rather, it is the task of those who “have been elevated above” the science of nature²⁸⁰. This statement, if it really reflects Porphyry's view, would corroborate the contents of the Syriac text, where Platonic philosophy stands above Aristotelian, while the latter is treated as an instrument.

276 In the tradition of Neopythagoreanism, Porphyry was interested in the figure of Pythagoras. His idea was to present the similarity between Platonic and Pythagorean philosophy. The same idea possibly underlies the final passage of the first, introductory, part of the treatise (§16). There, the author expresses his intention to discuss Pythagoras' views on First Principles, not together with other philosophers, but to deal with both philosophers separately later.

277 See 2.5.2 and 2.5.3, above.

278 See 2.5.3, above.

279 See Karamanolis, *Plato and Aristotle in Agreement?*, 243.

280 Simplicius, *In Arist. Phys.* I 1, 184a10: ὁ δὲ Πορφύριος οὐδὲ φυσικοῦ φησιν εἶναι τὸ ζητεῖν, εἰ εἰσὶν ἀρχαὶ τῶν φυσικῶν, ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἀναβεβηκότος· ὁ γὰρ φυσικὸς ὡς δεδομέναις χρῆται. ἔτι δὲ μᾶλλον φαίη ἂν τὸ τίνας αἱ ἀρχαὶ τοῦ ἀναβεβηκότος εἶναι ζητεῖν. οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁ γεωμέτρης ἢ ὁ ἰατρός τὰς ἑαυτοῦ ἀρχὰς ἀποδείκνυσιν, ἀλλ' ὡς οὔσαις καὶ τοιαῖσδε οὔσαις χρῆται. (9.11–15 Diels).

In the discussion on the generation of the world, Porphyry stated that Plato talked about the world as generated (γεννητός) for the sake of exposition (διδασκαλίας χάριν)²⁸¹. This notion makes Porphyry's interpretation of Plato's γεννητός a complex issue which could be understood in various ways by different authors²⁸². This question is not explicitly discussed in *PM*, though it plays a decisive role in the interpretation of Prime Matter²⁸³, the issue that stands at the core of the treatise.

Part 4, which deals with the definition of Matter as one of the principles, contains an extensive discussion of the question whether Matter is incorporeal (§§56–67). This portion of the treatise provides more material for the comparison between *PM* and the preserved texts of Porphyry²⁸⁴. In his *Sententiae*, Porphyry defines Matter as “incorporeal (because it is other than bodies), lifeless (because it is neither Intellect, nor Soul, nor living by itself), formless, irrational, infinite, impotent”²⁸⁵. The same definitions appear in *PM* §§40–67. They do not necessarily point to Porphyry as the author, for they reflect traditional Platonic teachings. However, what makes it very likely that it was Plotinus' disciple who composed the text is the combination of Platonic ideas with Aristotelian methods of expounding them, a tendency which was not apparent before Porphyry.

The exposition of the notion of Prime Matter in *PM* ends with the conclusion that Matter is neither a body, nor incorporeal, but is potentially body, which reflects a standard Middle Platonist interpretation of Plato's texts (see above). In so doing, the author of *PM* suggests a series of arguments as to why Matter is not a body, which in §63 specifically addresses the Stoic understanding of Matter as three-dimensional and having resistance (ἀντιτυπία).

Porphyry's arguments in these paragraphs derive to a large extent from the discourse *On Matter* of his teacher Plotinus (*Enneads* II.4)²⁸⁶, who vigorously criticized Stoic materialism. Plotinus' exposition of the topic of Matter and his anti-Stoic arguments served as a source for Simplicius, who, in his commentary on Aristotle's

281 Cf. Proclus, *In Tim.* 28bc (I 382.12–383.22 Diehl); Philoponus, *Contra Proclum* XIV.3 (546.5–547.19 Rabe = Fr. 48–50 Sodano). Cf. Baltes, *Die Weltentstehung*, vol. 1, 148–150.

282 For a detailed analysis of Porphyry's views, see Baltes, *Die Weltentstehung*, vol. 1, 136–163. Cf. Verrycken, “Porphyry In Timaeum Fr. XXXVII”.

283 Philoponus, *Contra Proclum* VI.2 (126–127 Rabe): Porphyry differentiates between God, who is Father and thus begets the world, and Creator, who takes the pre-existing Matter.

284 For Porphyry's notion of Matter, see Smith, “The Significance of ‘Physics’ in Porphyry”.

285 *Sent.* 20: Τῆς ὕλης τὰ ἴδια κατὰ τοὺς ἀρχαίους τάδε· ἀσώματος — ἐτέρα γὰρ σωμάτων —, ἄζωος — οὔτε γὰρ νοῦς οὔτε ψυχὴ οὐ ζῶν καθ' ἑαυτό —, ἀνείδεος, ἄλογος, ἄπειρος, δύναμος (10–20 Lamberz). See also *Sent.* 42 (53–54 Lamberz), where Porphyry makes a distinction between two kinds of incorporeals. For Porphyry's idea of incorporeals, see Karamanolis, *Plato and Aristotle in Agreement?*, 308–313; Chiaradonna, “Porphyry's views on the immanent incorporeals”.

286 Περί ὕλης: Plotinus, *Enn.* II.4 (I 184–201 Henry & Schwyzer). Cf. De Haas, *John Philoponus' New Definition of Prime Matter*, 100–112.

Physics, exposed them in a series of logical syllogisms, stating that Matter is not a body. The exposition of Simplicius turns out to be particularly close to the *PM*:

*Simplicius, In Arist. Phys.*²⁸⁷

PM §§56, 57, 62, 63

So you might also syllogise it the following ways: In itself matter has neither magnitude nor shape nor number; but body in itself does have magnitude and shape and number; therefore matter is not body. Matter is not a composite of matter and form; but body is a composite of matter and form.

⟨...⟩

Furthermore, body is composed of genus and differentiae, since it is a three-dimensional substance. However, such a thing is a form, but it is not matter. Furthermore, body is logically opposed to incorporeal qualities, but matter is related in the same way to all things. Furthermore, body is determined by three dimensions, but matter is completely indeterminate.

It follows from this that we should consider whether Matter is embodied or not embodied. I state, namely, that it is not simply embodied, and neither is it unembodied, but rather it is potentially a body and something embodied. For that which is properly called body is composed of matter and quality. Therefore, it is not a body. Further, there is no body which is not qualified. But Matter by its own definition has no quality. Therefore, it is not a body. Further, similarly, every body has limits and boundaries. But Matter by its definition has no limits and boundaries. Therefore, it is not a body.

⟨...⟩

Further, Matter is something simple and not composite. A body is not simple, but composite. Therefore, it is not a body. Further, if Matter were a body, it would have the definition of a body, that is, it would have three dimensions, or it could be divided three-dimensionally, and have resistance. But Matter does not have these, otherwise it too would be quantified and qualified, but all this does not belong to the account of its essence. Therefore, it is not a body.

²⁸⁷ Simplicius, *In Arist. Phys.* I 7, 191a7: ὥστε καὶ συλλογίσαιο ἂν οὕτως· ἡ ὕλη οὐτε μέγεθος ἔχει οὐτε σχῆμα οὐτε ἀριθμὸν καθ' αὐτήν· τὸ σῶμα μέγεθος ἔχει καὶ σχῆμα καὶ ἀριθμὸν καθ' αὐτό· ἡ ὕλη ἄρα οὐκ ἔστι σῶμα. ἡ ὕλη οὐκ ἔστι σύνθετος ἐξ ὕλης καὶ εἶδους· τὸ σῶμα σύνθετόν ἐστιν ἐξ ὕλης καὶ εἶδους. ⟨...⟩ ἔτι δὲ τὸ σῶμα ἐκ γένους καὶ διαφορῶν συνέστηκεν· οὐσία γάρ ἐστι τριχῇ διαστατή. τὸ δὲ τοιοῦτον εἶδος ἐστίν, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ ὕλη. ἔτι δὲ τὸ σῶμα πρὸς τὰς ἀσωμάτους ποιότητας ἀντιδιήρηται, ἡ δὲ ὕλη ὁμοίως ἔχει πρὸς πάντα. ἔτι δὲ τὸ σῶμα τρισὶν ὥρισται διαστάσεσιν, ἡ δὲ ὕλη παντελῶς ἐστὶν ἀόριστος. (229.16–230.14 Diels). The English translation is adapted with some modifications from Baltussen et al., *Simplicius. On Aristotle Physics 1.5–9*, 111–112.

Simplicius points to Plotinus as the source of this series of syllogisms that aim to demonstrate that Prime Matter is not body. A similar logical exposition appears in John Philoponus' *De Aeternitate mundi contra Proclum*²⁸⁸, and we can thus assume that both authors derived it from the same source, in which Plotinus' treatise *On Matter* had been transformed into a set of logical syllogisms. Porphyry, who was a disciple of Plotinus and who had heard those lectures of his master, which turned into part II.4 of the *Enneads*, would be a likely author of such an exposition of Plotinus' thoughts on Matter. It is thus possible that Simplicius borrowed his syllogisms not from the *Enneads*, but from Porphyry, whose treatise *Περὶ ὕλης* he quotes immediately after the set of syllogisms about Prime Matter. The quoted passage from Porphyry's *Περὶ ὕλης* contains the presentation of the views of the Pythagorean Moderatus (see above). Given Porphyry's method of presentation, it is very likely that he has also included the arguments of his teacher Plotinus in his work, which were similar to those found in *PM*, and that this text became Simplicius' source.

A further parallel between the Syriac treatise and Porphyry appears in §86, where the author suggests making a distinction between the constitution of the world and the constitution of bodies. The author of *PM* argues that the category of Matter belongs to the constitution of bodies, while the category of First Principles belongs to the constitution of the world, and that without differentiating between these two things, one may fall into the mistake of misunderstanding the words of Plato as referring to the world and apply them to bodies. In §86, we read a summary of this argument:

One thing is the constitution of the world, and another is that of the bodies. For the constitution of the world as world has primary bodies as principles, while that of bodies as bodies has matter, form, and shapes.

Proclus makes the same distinction between the constitution of the world and the constitution of the primary bodies in his commentary on *Tim.* 30a, i.e. in that part which presents a summary of Porphyry's ideas (see above)²⁸⁹. Proclus' testimony is corroborated by Philoponus. In the *De Aeternitate mundi contra Proclum*, the Alexandrian philosopher has preserved the following two extensive quotations from Porphyry's commentary on the *Timaeus*²⁹⁰:

²⁸⁸ Cf. De Haas, *John Philoponus' New Definition of Prime Matter*, 109–112.

²⁸⁹ Proclus, *In Tim.* II [Tim. 30A]: τί δὴ ποτε οὖν ὑπέθετο τὴν ἀταξίαν; ἢ ἵνα θεωρήσωμεν, ὅπως ἄλλη μὲν ἢ τῶν σωμάτων γενεσις, ἄλλη δὲ ἡ γενομένων αὐτῶν τάξις, ὑποθετέον ὄντα μὲν αὐτά, κινούμενα δὲ ἀτάκτως· αὐτὰ γὰρ τάττειν τὰ σώματα ἀδύνατον (I 394.25–29 Diehl).

²⁹⁰ Philoponus, *Contra Proclum* VI.14: ὅτι δὲ τοῦτο ἐστὶν ἀληθές, μάρτυς καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Πορφύριος· καίτοι γὰρ εἰπὼν γενητὸν λέγεσθαι τὸν κόσμον ὡς σύνθετον ἐξ ὕλης καὶ εἴδους προελθὼν καὶ ἐξηγούμενος τὸ 'παρалаβὼν ὁ θεὸς ὅσον ἦν ὁρατὸν οὐχ ἡσυχίαν ἄγον ἀλλὰ πλημμελῶς καὶ ἀτάκτως κινούμενον' φησὶν ἐπὶ λέξεως ταῦτα 'οὐκ ἐστὶν ταῦτὸν κόσμου ποίησις καὶ σώματος ὑπόστασις οὐδὲ

Porphyry himself is a witness that this is true. Although he has previously stated that the world is said to be generated in that it is composed of matter and form, later, when commenting on the words “the god, taking over all that was visible, not at rest but moving in a discordant and disorderly manner”, he, to quote his exact words, writes this:

“The making of the world and the creation of body are not the same thing, nor are the beginnings of body and of the world the same. For the world to come to be, both bodies and God must exist, for bodies to exist, there must be matter, God, and supervening [form] (one lot so that the matter may become body, and another to give order to the things that have become body). All of these always come into existence at once and not separately over time, but instruction necessarily separates them so as to be able to explain that which comes to be accurately. The beginnings of body are God, who is the begetter, matter, and the shapes that [Plato] will tell us about later, the things from which bodies are composed being begotten of God; those of the world are bodies, which already exist through the agency of God, and God, who gives them order.”

And a bit later:

“It should be taken as evidence that the framing of body and that of the world are not in Plato’s view the same thing and that at this point [the creator] takes over not matter but bodies that have been produced from matter, that he says that what is taken over is visible — and what could visible things be other than bodies? Matter in his view is invisible and formless, being apprehended only with difficulty by [a kind of] spurious reasoning — and that he goes on to show the generation of bodies even though he has [already] shown the framing of the world in this passage. After the generation of the world he returns to the generation of body.”

The last sentence, in the first fragment quoted by Philoponus, stresses that primary bodies “already exist through the agency of God” before God “gives them order”, the

αἱ αὐταὶ ἀρχαὶ σώματός τε καὶ κόσμου, ἀλλ’ ἵνα μὲν κόσμος γένηται, δεῖ σώματα εἶναι καὶ θεὸν εἶναι, ἵνα δὲ σώματα, δεῖ ὕλην εἶναι καὶ θεὸν καὶ τὸ ἐπιγινόμενον ἄλλο μὲν, ἵνα σωματωθῇ ὕλη, ἄλλο δέ, ἵνα τὰ σωματωθέντα ταχθῇ. ταῦτα δὲ αἰεὶ ἅμα γίνεται πάντα καὶ οὐ χρόνῳ διηρ. τημένα, ἀλλ’ ἢ γε διδασκαλία ἀναγκαιῶς διαιρεῖ, ἵνα διδάσκῃ ἀκριβῶς τὸ γιγνόμενον· σώματος μὲν γὰρ ἀρχαὶ θεὸς μὲν γεννῶν, ὕλη δὲ καὶ τὰ σχήματα, ἃ προῖών ἡμᾶς διδάξει, ὡς ἐξ ὧν συνέστηκεν τὰ σώματα γεννηθέντων ἀπὸ θεοῦ, κόσμου δὲ τὰ ἥδη ὑποστάντα σώματα ὑπὸ θεοῦ καὶ θεὸς ὁ ταῦτα τάσσω· καὶ μετ’ ὀλίγα ‘τεκμήριον δὲ τοῦ τε μὴ ταῦτὸν εἶναι κατὰ Πλάτωνα σώματος σύστασιν καὶ κόσμου καὶ ὅτι νῦν μὴ τὴν ὕλην παραλαμβάνει ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐξ ὕλης ἀποτελεσθέντα σώματα ἐκεῖνο γινέσθω τὸ ὁρατὸν λέγειν εἶναι τὰ παραληφθέντα (τὰ δὲ ὁρατὰ τί ἂν εἴη ἡ σώματα; ἡ δὲ ὕλη αἰδῆς καὶ ἄμορφος κατ’ αὐτὸν καὶ μόγις νόθῳ λογισμῷ λαμβανομένη) καὶ τὸ προελθόντα σωμάτων γένεσιν δεικνύναι καίτοι ἐνταῦθα κόσμου ἐπιδείξαντα σύστασιν· ἀλλ’ ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου γενέσεως ἀνατρέχει ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ σώματος γένεσιν’. (164.12–165.16 Rabe = Fr. 47 and 49 Sodano). The English translation is adapted from Share, *Philoponus. Against Proclus*, 39–40.

statement that forms the content of the last paragraphs of *PM* with the reference to the authority of Severus.

In the twelfth century, Philoponus' treatise probably served as a source for the exposition of Porphyry's notion of Prime Matter for the Arabic philosopher Ibn Rushd (Averroes), who in his epitome of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* suggests the following summary of this issue²⁹¹:

Some (philosophers) made the three dimensions the first thing installed in formless prime matter and the principles of a thing whereby matter receives form. Furthermore, they maintained that the term "body" signifies most properly this meaning (of informed matter), since "substance" signifies this only *qua* (abstract) root morpheme because substances are (that which is) not in a substrate. This is what Porphyry taught, who claimed that this is the doctrine of previous philosophers such as Plato and others.

The account of Ibn Rushd, which is second-hand, does not bring us additional information on Porphyry's notion of Prime Matter. However, it sums up the main points which we find in *PM* and testifies to knowledge of Porphyry's philosophy among the Arabic scholars of early medieval times²⁹².

Based on the preserved evidence concerning Porphyry's writings and due to the apparent loss of the beginning of the Syriac translation, we cannot state with certainty what the original title of the Greek work he composed was. It is likely that Plotinus' disciple wrote several works concerning First Principles and Matter that are now lost in Greek, one of which has been preserved in Syriac translation. The title proposed for the present edition, *On Principles and Matter*, is based first of all on the internal evidence; it should be taken as a description of the contents of the published text rather than the actual title of Porphyry's lost work.

The *terminus post quem* for the composition of the Greek text of *PM* may be 263 AD. In that year, Porphyry moved from Athens to Rome, where he started to take classes with Plotinus. It was only after that date that Porphyry was able to call himself a disciple of both Longinus and Plotinus, a self-characterisation which the author of

²⁹¹ Arabic text: فنقول ان قوما جعلوا اول شيء يحل في الهيولى الاولى الغير مصورة الابعاد الثلاثة وانما اول شيء يتصور بها الهيولى وراوا ان اسم الجسم ادل على هذا المعنى اذ كانت الجواهر انما تدل عليها بالمثل الاولى من اجل انما ليست في موضوع وهذا القول قول فرقيوس وزعم انه قول الفلاسفة المتقدم افلاطن وغيره (Rodríguez, Averroes. *Compendio de Metafisica*, 76.6–11). The English translation is adapted from Arnzen, *Averroes on Aristotle's Metaphysics*, 89–90. Cf. the translation of David Wasserstein in Smith, *Porphyrii Philosophi Fragmenta*, 541 (Fr. 464).

²⁹² Another account of Porphyry's notion of Prime Matter, which is most likely based on second-hand knowledge, has been preserved by al-Shahrastani, see Cureton, *Kitāb al-milal wa-l-nihāl*, 345–346. An English translation of this fragment by David Wasserstein is included in Smith, *Porphyrii Philosophi Fragmenta*, 541–542 (Fr. 465).

the Syriac text makes. The form of the treatise, which is composed as some kind of propedeutic, makes it rather likely that it appeared at a later time, namely in the last decades of the third century, when Porphyry took over the school of Plotinus after his death in 270. If the latter assumption is correct, then the date of the composition of the Greek treatise lies between 270 and 301/305.

The reference to Porphyry's works by Proclus and the quotations by Philoponus and Simplicius make it probable that the treatise was read both in Athenian and in Alexandrian philosophical circles in the fifth-sixth centuries. Later on, it became known not only to the Alexandrian *philoponoï*, but also to the Syrian scholars, who labelled themselves with the same title and considered themselves the heirs of the Alexandrian Christian apologists. The alleged references to Porphyry by the Arabic philosophers demonstrate that Porphyry's works and ideas made the journey "from Alexandria to Baghdad"²⁹³ which was characteristic of a large amount of scholarly and philosophical literature in the late ancient and early medieval periods.

²⁹³ See Meyerhof, "Von Alexandrien nach Bagdad".

3 Conclusion

The Syriac text published in the present book has had a long transmission history before it came to light at the beginning of the 21st century. The main stages of this history may be outlined as follows:

end of the 2nd to the beginning of the 3rd c.	The doxographical source, which was known to Sextus Empiricus, to the author of the <i>Refutatio</i> (ascribed to Hippolytus of Rome), and to Porphyry, probably appeared at this period, although an earlier dating is also possible. At this time, the Middle Platonists Atticus and Severus wrote their commentaries on Plato's <i>Timaeus</i> .
between 270 and 301/305	Porphyry of Tyre composed the Greek version of <i>PM</i> , which integrated both the doxographical source and the Middle Platonist commentaries.
middle of the 7th c.	The Greek text of the treatise was translated into Syriac in the Syrian Orthodox monastery Qenneshre. It is most likely that Severus Sebokht (d. 666/667) was responsible for the translation.
mid-7th to mid-8th c.	A copy of the Syriac version came to the library of the monastery Mar Mattai, where it was preserved until the 13th century, when Barhebraeus consulted it.
781/782	The East Syrian Catholicos Timothy I described the contents of the Syriac version of the treatise, which at that time was in the library of Mar Mattai.
late 9th c.	A copy of the codex described by Timothy was produced. This copy later became Part B of ms. DS 27.
ca. 975	The copy of the codex from Mar Mattai (Part B of ms. DS 27) reached the Egyptian monastery Dayr al-Suryan as part of the collection of manuscripts brought to Egypt by the Coptic patriarch Abraham b. Zur'a.
1266/1267	Syrian Orthodox Maphrian Barhebraeus composed an epitome of the treatise, which he integrated into his theological compendium <i>Candelabra of Sanctuary</i> .

Porphyry
On Principles and Matter

Syriac Text and English Translation

Abbreviations and signs used in the edition

cod.	<i>codex</i> Dayr al-Suryan 27, Part B (9th cent.)
Barhebr.	Barhebraeus, <i>Candelabra of Sanctuary</i> (ed. Bakoš)
add.	<i>addidit</i> “added (in the ms.)”
corr.	<i>correxit</i> “(a scribe) corrected”
fort. leg.	<i>fortasse legendum</i> “perhaps one should read”
in marg.	<i>in margine</i> “in the margin (of the ms.)”
om.	<i>omisit</i> “(ms.) omits”
parum cl.	<i>parum clare</i> “not clear enough (in the ms.)”
scr.	<i>scripsi</i> “I (i.e. the editor) have written”
supra lin.	<i>supra lineam</i> “above the line (in the ms.)”
§	paragraph division introduced by the editor
<...>	material supplied by the editor
[...]	material secluded by the editor
(...)	additions in the English translation

f. 114v אכלם בגדו חמטק על אינך קעסל. כח מוטא ואכזיג וטא §1

[illegible][illegible]

col. b אממא עבדא ,ת דמחא אר . אממא עבדא ,ת דמחא אר .

[illegible]

§3 قیاس کے تحت فی الواقعہ و مقتضی احکامہ جیسا کہ آیت

15 መጽሐፍ ዘኢየሱስ ክርስቶስ ምዕራፍ 1፡1-18

[illegible]

20 20
 21 21
 22 22
 23 23
 24 24
 25 25
 26 26
 27 27
 28 28
 29 29
 30 30
 31 31
 32 32
 33 33
 34 34
 35 35
 36 36
 37 37
 38 38
 39 39
 40 40
 41 41
 42 42
 43 43
 44 44
 45 45
 46 46
 47 47
 48 48
 49 49
 50 50
 51 51
 52 52
 53 53
 54 54
 55 55
 56 56
 57 57
 58 58
 59 59
 60 60
 61 61
 62 62
 63 63
 64 64
 65 65
 66 66
 67 67
 68 68
 69 69
 70 70
 71 71
 72 72
 73 73
 74 74
 75 75
 76 76
 77 77
 78 78
 79 79
 80 80
 81 81
 82 82
 83 83
 84 84
 85 85
 86 86
 87 87
 88 88
 89 89
 90 90
 91 91
 92 92
 93 93
 94 94
 95 95
 96 96
 97 97
 98 98
 99 99
 100 100

§5. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100. 101. 102. 103. 104. 105. 106. 107. 108. 109. 110. 111. 112. 113. 114. 115. 116. 117. 118. 119. 120. 121. 122. 123. 124. 125. 126. 127. 128. 129. 130. 131. 132. 133. 134. 135. 136. 137. 138. 139. 140. 141. 142. 143. 144. 145. 146. 147. 148. 149. 150. 151. 152. 153. 154. 155. 156. 157. 158. 159. 160. 161. 162. 163. 164. 165. 166. 167. 168. 169. 170. 171. 172. 173. 174. 175. 176. 177. 178. 179. 180. 181. 182. 183. 184. 185. 186. 187. 188. 189. 190. 191. 192. 193. 194. 195. 196. 197. 198. 199. 200. 201. 202. 203. 204. 205. 206. 207. 208. 209. 210. 211. 212. 213. 214. 215. 216. 217. 218. 219. 220. 221. 222. 223. 224. 225. 226. 227. 228. 229. 230. 231. 232. 233. 234. 235. 236. 237. 238. 239. 240. 241. 242. 243. 244. 245. 246. 247. 248. 249. 250. 251. 252. 253. 254. 255. 256. 257. 258. 259. 260. 261. 262. 263. 264. 265. 266. 267. 268. 269. 270. 271. 272. 273. 274. 275. 276. 277. 278. 279. 280. 281. 282. 283. 284. 285. 286. 287. 288. 289. 290. 291. 292. 293. 294. 295. 296. 297. 298. 299. 300. 301. 302. 303. 304. 305. 306. 307. 308. 309. 310. 311. 312. 313. 314. 315. 316. 317. 318. 319. 320. 321. 322. 323. 324. 325. 326. 327. 328. 329. 330. 331. 332. 333. 334. 335. 336. 337. 338. 339. 340. 341. 342. 343. 344. 345. 346. 347. 348. 349. 350. 351. 352. 353. 354. 355. 356. 357. 358. 359. 360. 361. 362. 363. 364. 365. 366. 367. 368. 369. 370. 371. 372. 373. 374. 375. 376. 377. 378. 379. 380. 381. 382. 383. 384. 385. 386. 387. 388. 389. 390. 391. 392. 393. 394. 395. 396. 397. 398. 399. 400. 401. 402. 403. 404. 405. 406. 407. 408. 409. 410. 411. 412. 413. 414. 415. 416. 417. 418. 419. 420. 421. 422. 423. 424. 425. 426. 427. 428. 429. 430. 431. 432. 433. 434. 435. 436. 437. 438. 439. 440. 441. 442. 443. 444. 445. 446. 447. 448. 449. 450. 451. 452. 453. 454. 455. 456. 457. 458. 459. 460. 461. 462. 463. 464. 465. 466. 467. 468. 469. 470. 471. 472. 473. 474. 475. 476. 477. 478. 479. 480. 481. 482. 483. 484. 485. 486. 487. 488. 489. 490. 491. 492. 493. 494. 495. 496. 497. 498. 499. 500. 501. 502. 503. 504. 505. 506. 507. 508. 509. 510. 511. 512. 513. 514. 515. 516. 517. 518. 519. 520. 521. 522. 523. 524. 525. 526. 527. 528. 529. 530. 531. 532. 533. 534. 535. 536. 537. 538. 539. 540. 541. 542. 543. 544. 545. 546. 547. 548. 549. 550. 551. 552. 553. 554. 555. 556. 557. 558. 559. 560. 561. 562. 563. 564. 565. 566. 567. 568. 569. 570. 571. 572. 573. 574. 575. 576. 577. 578. 579. 580. 581. 582. 583. 584. 585. 586. 587. 588. 589. 590. 591. 592. 593. 594. 595. 596. 597. 598. 599. 600. 601. 602. 603. 604. 605. 606. 607. 608. 609. 610. 611. 612. 613. 614. 615. 616. 617. 618. 619. 620. 621. 622. 623. 624. 625. 626. 627. 628. 629. 630. 631. 632. 633. 634. 635. 636. 637. 638. 639. 640. 641. 642. 643. 644. 645. 646. 647. 648. 649. 650. 651. 652. 653. 654. 655. 656. 657. 658. 659. 660. 661. 662. 663. 664. 665. 666. 667. 668. 669. 670. 671. 672. 673. 674. 675. 676. 677. 678. 679. 680. 681. 682. 683. 684. 685. 686. 687. 688. 689. 690. 691. 692. 693. 694. 695. 696. 697. 698. 699. 700. 701. 702. 703. 704. 705. 706. 707. 708. 709. 710. 711. 712. 713. 714. 715. 716. 717. 718. 719. 720. 721. 722. 723. 724. 725. 726. 727. 728. 729. 730. 731. 732. 733. 734. 735. 736. 737. 738. 739. 740. 741. 742. 743. 744. 745. 746. 747. 748. 749. 750. 751. 752. 753. 754. 755. 756. 757. 758. 759. 760. 761. 762. 763. 764. 765. 766. 767. 768. 769. 770. 771. 772. 773. 774. 775. 776. 777. 778. 779. 780. 781. 782. 783. 784. 785. 786. 787. 788. 789. 790. 791. 792. 793. 794. 795. 796. 797. 798. 799. 800. 801. 802. 803. 804. 805. 806. 807. 808. 809. 810. 811. 812. 813. 814. 815. 816. 817. 818. 819. 820. 821. 822. 823. 824. 825. 826. 827. 828. 829. 830. 831. 832. 833. 834. 835. 836. 837. 838. 839. 840

[illegible]

(1. *Doxography*)

- §1 Among those who did research on natural principles, some said that the first principle is one, and some said that the principles of natural things are many. And among those who said that (the first principle) is one, some said that it is motionless and some that it is in motion. And further, among those who said that the natural principles are many, some said that they were finite and some stated that they were infinite. And further, among those who stated that they were finite, some said that they were two, some that they were three, some that they were four.
- §2 Now, not a single philosophical school (αἵρεσις) escapes from this division. But necessarily, it may either be classified under the category that states that there is one principle, or under that one which states that there are many. And if there is one, it may be classified either under the category that says that it is in motion or that it is motionless. And if there are many, it may be classified as follows: they are either finite or infinite.
- §3 For many ancient philosophers who did research on nature supposed that there were material (ὕλικός) principles of existing things. Namely, that there is something out of which everything exists, from which everything originally came to be, and into which (everything) also will finally perish, while it remains unchangeable in its nature but changes in its accidents.
- §4 About such a thing we say that it is an element (στοιχεῖον) and a principle of existing things. And because it is a principle, it neither comes to be, (nor) perishes, but always remains unchangeable in its essence, while it may change in its accidents. For as in the case of Socrates we do not say simply that he comes to be when he becomes white or black¹, neither that he perishes when he is deprived of these (colours), because the essence of Socrates is preserved and exists through such changes; in the same way we ought to speak about the material principle.
- §5 However, it was not in one and the same way that those who originally did research on nature spoke about this principle concerning its kind and number. But Thales, who was the original inventor of this philosophy, said that water was the first principle, from which everything came into existence,

1 Ms. has “substance”, which is probably a scribal mistake.

[illegible]

f. 104r §6 مجلسه‌ای در / این روز، در آن سال که در آن وقت که در آن

[illegible]

മോശൻ: ഞാൻ ഇനി യെരൂശലേം പോകുകയും ചെയ്യും

[illegible]

§8 ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಅಧ್ಯಾಯ : ಮಹಾಕವಿಗಳ ಜೀವನ ಚರಿತ್ರೆ

[illegible][illegible][illegible]

§10 אֲנִי וְאִשְׁתִּי לְפָנֶיךָ לַחֲסִידֶיךָ מִיָּדְךָ חַיִּים וְחַיִּים וְחַיִּים 20

[illegible][illegible]

§11 **ለመጀመሪያ ጊዜ ለጥያቄው ስርዓተ ምርመራ ማድረግ**

על כלל המעשה הזה. וכלל המעשה הזה.

10 ശബ്ദം scr.: ശബ്ദം cod. | ശല്പിഥിനാ scr.: ശല്പിഥിനാ cod. 12 ചലഞ്ച scr.: ചലഞ്ച cod. 20 വിഷ്ണുവ scr.: വിഷ്ണുവ cod.

in that he saw that wetness gave nourishment for everything and that heat also came into existence from it. Thus, because everything that comes to be originates from it, it is the first principle of everything.

§6 It seems to me that this is also what some of the poets meant who spoke about the gods. For they called Oceanus, that is the sea, and Tethys, that is moisture, “the parents of everything that existed”² and they said that of all gods water should be honored first of all. Thus, this is the first doctrine about a material principle. As we said, its author was Thales.

§7 Anaximenes, then, and before him Diogenes, stated that the first principle is air, whereas Hippasus and Heraclitus (declared) that it is fire. Each one of them stated that the material principle is in motion and one.

§8 That it is one and motionless (was stated by) Xenophanes. For he rejected any generation and corruption and any motion at all. He said that everything is one and stated it to exist apart from any change.

§9 This is (also) what Parmenides and Melissus said. They said that the principle is one and motionless, and that what exists is one. But it seems to me that Parmenides says that what exists is one, while he considers it to be one in reason and not in number; whereas Melissus states that it is one in number and in matter. Therefore, the former said that it is finite, while the latter that it is infinite.

§10 Anaxagoras states that principles are infinite, while he introduces things with like parts (i.e. ὁμοιομέπειαι) as principles. And while he mingles and separates them, he makes other things concomitant with each other. This is how generation and corruption occur to those things which are mixed and divided. He stated that the active cause of generation is intellect. However, he did not remain in this (opinion), but, like someone who vacillates on this issue, he turned back again towards material principles.

§11 Leucippus, too, says that principles are infinite and that they have change and continuous generation. Further, he said that something that exists is not

2 Homer, *Iliad* XIV.246 (52 West).

[illegible]

§12 لعلہ اب انہما تعلم کہ وہ کہتے ہیں کہ یہ لہ (محققہ)

[illegible]

§13 ኢትዮጵያዊ ሕግ ላይ የተመሰረተ ሕግ ሲሆን፣

[illegible]

അമൃതം ഇതേ നമോലം അനുനാദം പരമം പരമം പരമം §14

15. \vec{a} and \vec{b} are two vectors such that $|\vec{a}| = 3$ and $|\vec{b}| = 4$. Find the value of $|\vec{a} + \vec{b}|$ if \vec{a} and \vec{b} are perpendicular to each other.

§15

f. 104v

§16 حد احسنكم ان يصح فيه ختم كختمكم من ان احل الله افواهكم

[illegible]

§17 ازم ہم لحد: دیاتہم کہہ کر و حلقہ اشک حسیہ پیشہ کر دیا۔

25 ከጋራው ጋር ለመገናኘት ለመገናኘት ለመገናኘት ለመገናኘት ለመገናኘት

1 ,מאבא דל אר ,מאבא] add. in marg.: דל מלמלמל דל דל דל דל ,מאבא
 דלמלמלמל דל ,מאבא 4 [מלמלמל] corr. in marg., Barhebr. 12 דלמל scr.: דלמל cod.
 13 דלמל scr.: דלמל cod. 22 [דלמל] add. supra lin.

more than something that does not exist³. This was supported by Democritus. He, too, said that principles are infinite, declaring that they are one in genus (γένος) but different in shapes (σχήματα), forms (εἶδη), or in opposition.

§12 Epicurus also seems to have agreed with them. He, too, said that the principles are in(finite)⁴ and indivisible, that they are moving in the infinite void, that they have size, shape, and weight, and further that they are similar to something without parts. When they interweave with and adhere to one another, they complete the world and what is in it.

§13 Empedocles said that the principles are finite. He said that there are four roots of existing things — earth, water, fire, and air — and that combination and separation of them come about part by part. Combination, that is coming-to-be, he called “love”, and separation, that is corruption, (he called) “victory”⁵. Thus, according to this doctrine of his, there are four principles.

§14 Aristotle said that the principles of physical bodies are matter (ὕλη), form (εἶδος), and privation, while shapes (σχήματα) and forms (εἶδη) are different.

§15 Those from the Stoa said that the principles are God and Matter, while they neither define in substance (οὐσία) nor differentiate that which is active from that which is passive. But they say that that which is active differs from that which is passive in potentiality. [But they say that they differ in potentiality.]⁶ What is active is God. What is passive is Matter.

§16 The views of the Pythagoreans we will discuss when we speak about those of Plato. Thus, we will speak about the principles according to the views of Plato, following what we have started (to say) above in this discourse.

(2. Introductory Issues)

§17 We ought to know that there are two types of the demonstrative science. One (type) by means of prior things demonstrates the posterior. It is character-

3 A commentary in the left margin of the ms.: “By ‘exists’ he meant atoms, i.e. the indivisible, and by ‘does not exist’ the void.”

4 The word “finite” is added in the margin of the ms. and it occurs in the main text of the version of Barhebraeus (Bakoš, *Le candélabre*, 544.8).

5 Syriac has ܠܚܝܩܐ corresponding to Gr. νίκος (a late ancient variant of νίκη), “victory”, instead of νεῖκος, “strife”. The same error occurs in the version of Barhebraeus (Bakoš, *Le candélabre*, 545.2) and it may be based either on a variant in the Greek text or, more likely, on a misunderstanding by the Syriac translator.

6 These words appear twice in the manuscript, first at the end of fol. 104r and then at the beginning of fol. 104v. This is most likely a dittography.

istic of syllogisms. Those first compositions from which conclusions are drawn are prior. Another (type) by means of posterior things demonstrates the prior. It is characteristic of the introductory science. And now, as our discourse is about principles, prior to which nothing may be thought, we employ the initial type of the demonstrative science.

§18 Now, we say that it is acknowledged by everyone, both by philosophers and by those who are not philosophers, that we have senses and that we also have intellect, and that they differ from each other. And if this is true, their activities also necessarily differ from each other. For just as the faculties differ from each other, likewise their activities differ from each other. So, the activity of senses is sensation and that of intellect is thinking.

§19 There are necessarily intelligible things and perceptible things. If things exist completely in relation to something and are intelligible, they “can be apprehended by thought with the support of a reasoned account”⁷. And those things that are presumed and are also called perceptible, they are apprehended “by belief supported by unreasoned sensation”⁸, and they are called believed. The former exist permanently and are not subject to generation, while the latter do not exist permanently and are subject to generation.

§20 The perceptible things are prior in relation to us, but are secondary in relation to nature. Further, the intelligible things are prior in relation to nature, but are secondary in relation to our perception. As those things which are prior in relation to us are posterior in relation to nature, we will start moving from the introductory argument and ascend to those things that are properly and truly called principles.

§21 Thus, those things that are prior in relation to us are all perceptible ones, like fire, water, air, and earth. Those things that are composed and mixed from them are close to us. And even closer to us than those things are bodies. And inside bodies there is something hot, and something hard, something that can be seen, and something that can be grasped.

⁷ Plato, *Tim.* 28a1–2.

⁸ Plato, *Tim.* 28a2–3.

- §22 But it is known that there is nothing tangible and hard without earth, and also there is nothing visible (and) hot without fire. Therefore, there is something of earth and something of fire in us. There is also something of spirit in us that is contained in the arteries, and a wet nature contained in the veins. And it is evident that there is no wet nature without water and nothing like spirit appears unless there is air. Therefore, there is some part of water and also a part of air in us.
- §23 And because those things which are parts are in us, it is also necessary that those parts which are in them are in us. That is, the whole, therefore, is present in all bodies here, fire, water, air, and earth. Further, these bodies are divided into forms (εἶδη) and qualities. Fire (is divided) into heat, brightness, and lightness, and together with them into its shape (σχήμα) and aggregation. Further, we divide earth into its dryness and its coldness, and with them also into its stability, its firmness, its fixedness, and its shape. And in the same way, we also divide and differentiate in mind those two bodies that are in the middle, I mean air and water, making a distinction between their proper qualities and their distinct shapes.
- §24 After this, we investigate what it is, in which these qualities and forms (εἶδη) appear to subsist and exist. For we discover that there is something in which they are set, something that is established in order to receive them, while they do not have a basis for their existence in themselves. This thing, in which forms and qualities are imprinted and where they are set, we call “matter” (ὕλη). Thus, by means of this introductory science it became apparent to us that there is one principle of everything which is called “material” and “matter”.
- §25 But because the introductory science is followed by the complex one, which supplements a negative statement by a positive one, it is necessary to know that there are things which we exclude intellectually from Matter but then attach to it, and we supply it with forms, shapes, and qualities. To these things we further attach (other ones) and say that they are not “in a discordant and disorderly state”⁹ in Matter, but rather have some beauty and pleasant order.

9 Plato, *Tim.* 30a4–5.

- §26 But pleasant order and beauty do not exist without harmony. And also harmony does not exist without proportion. And proportion does not exist without reason. And such reason does not exist without foresight and foreknowledge, while the latter two do not exist without intellect. Thus, when intellect sets in motion through its actions, it imprints, adjusts, arranges, and sets in order forms, qualities, and shapes.
- §27 Thus, through the complex, the adding, and the attaching science, we found the active principle, which is Intellect. And because it is Intellect¹⁰ that arranges, orders, and sets these things through its actions¹¹, its actions are thoughts. These thoughts we call Forms, Ideas, and prior definitions of the things, for through them, i.e. through their image and likeness, things are formed and set in order.
- §28 Further, we have found also the third principle, in whose image things come to be. Thus, by means of the introductory science we have found Matter, and by means of the complex one the active cause, and through the activity of the latter we have found Idea and Form, according to whose image natures are formed. And because each one of these is a primary principle of existing things, we should first say what a principle is.

(3. Definition of a Principle)

- §29 A principle is a primary limit of those things which are posterior to it and which from it initially come to be. And because all principles exist as something that is prior to everything, it is also characteristic of the principle that it is simple, unqualified, and also eternal.
- §30 For if it is not simple, then it is compound. Consequently, there are also parts of which it is compound, whether we assume its composition to have occurred in time or in intellect and thinking. If this is so, then it is evident that the parts of which it is compound may be considered prior to it, either preceding it in time or in thinking. In this case, we cannot call it principle in the proper sense, but rather the parts of which it is compound. Therefore, something that is truly a principle must necessarily be simple.

¹⁰ A scribal mistake. Ms. has “Matter”.

¹¹ Ms. has “their actions”, which is most likely a scribal mistake.

§31 מִחֲכָהּ יָדָא אֶפְּרָא וְלֵא וְאִי אֶפְּרָא חֲכָהּ וְאִי אֶפְּרָא חֲכָהּ אֶפְּרָא חֲכָהּ
מִחֲכָהּ לֵא מִחֲכָהּ: חֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ וְחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ וְחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ
מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ, מִחֲכָהּ וְאִי חֲכָהּ וְאִי חֲכָהּ, מִחֲכָהּ.

§32 אֶפְּרָא יָדָא אֶפְּרָא חֲכָהּ אֶפְּרָא לֵא מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ: חֲכָהּ וְחֲכָהּ
מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ אֶפְּרָא חֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ: אֶפְּרָא חֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ
מִחֲכָהּ, מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ, מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ
לֵא מִחֲכָהּ: מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ, לֵא מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ
לֵא וְחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ, מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ.

§33 אֶפְּרָא יָדָא לֵא מִחֲכָהּ: לֵא מִחֲכָהּ וְחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ, אֶפְּרָא

10 לֵא מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ: לֵא מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ, לֵא מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ
לֵא לֵא מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ, לֵא מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ
אֶפְּרָא יָדָא מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ: מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ, מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ
מִחֲכָהּ, אֶפְּרָא יָדָא מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ, אֶפְּרָא

col. b אֶפְּרָא מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ: אֶפְּרָא | אֶפְּרָא חֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ, חֲכָהּ, חֲכָהּ
15 חֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ אֶפְּרָא מִחֲכָהּ: מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ, מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ
חֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ: חֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ.

§34 אֶפְּרָא מִחֲכָהּ לֵא מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ: אֶפְּרָא מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ
מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ: חֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ
חֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ: חֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ
20 אֶפְּרָא מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ: חֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ
מִחֲכָהּ, אֶפְּרָא מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ: חֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ
מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ, מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ.

§35 חֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ: אֶפְּרָא מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ
חֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ: חֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ
25 אֶפְּרָא מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ: אֶפְּרָא מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ
מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ: חֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ מִחֲכָהּ

- §31 In the same way, it is also unqualified. For if it is qualified and has quality, it is likewise compound of a subject and an accident. For it is in this way that something becomes something qualified. Consequently, a principle is unqualified.
- §32 I also call it eternal. For if it is not eternal, it will have started in time and existed for a particular time. If it is like that, it is necessary that it also had a cause from which it came to be. That (cause) would precede it and be considered prior to it, and would truly be a principle. For an active cause is prior to everything that comes to be. But it is proper that nothing should be prior to something that is a principle. Consequently, a principle is eternal.
- §33 Further, it is proper that principles of existing things must be imperishable. For if someone were to say that a principle perishes, he would not be able to show anything into which it perishes, for after it has perished, it can neither be reduced to simple things nor to composite ones. Because if one were to say that it perished into simple things, it would be clear that it either perishes into itself or into something else. But if (it perishes) into itself, then in this way it is still preserved without perishing. And further, if (it perishes) into something else that is simple, also in this way it will necessarily be the (same) with the object of search. And if (it perishes) into composite things, then it is obvious that it is preserved and exists in those things, since they are compound of it. For the composition of everything compound is of simple things.
- §34 But neither can it perish into nothing. For nothing perishes into what is completely nonexistent. What would follow from it is that we would negate everything that exists because of the destruction of the principle of every existing thing. Further, there would be no principle of anything, because there would be no principle from which it would come to be. Neither would anything else come to be from it, for it will be entirely nonexistent. Therefore, it is apparent that there is no principle which allows of perishing.
- §35 Now, after it has been said what a principle is and what its properties are, it is necessary to inquire whether fire is the First Principle from which existing things come to be, or whether it is earth, water, or air¹². If someone says that one of these elements (στοιχεῖα) is a principle, he errs by setting as a principle

12 A commentary in the right margin in the middle of the page: "Coming-to-be and perishing, singularity and plurality, fire and water."

כר נב כרנז כר. ולמכר נב כר נב נב נב נב נב נב נב
כרנז, כרנז

§36 וזמ למ נב לנכר. ונב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב

כרנז. ונב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב

5 נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב

כרנז נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב

נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב

נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב

f. 115r | נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב

10 נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב

כרנז נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב

כר נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב

נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב

נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב

15 נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב

נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב

נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב

נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב

נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב

20 נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב

נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב

נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב

נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב

נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב

25 נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב

נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב

7 add. in marg.: נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב
17 add. supra lin. נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב נב

that which comes to be. Instead, I say that coming-to-be has a principle from which it comes to be, but a principle is not a coming-to-be.

§36 In that case when the First Principles are reduced to two, it is necessary that they be opposite to each other. For this is also how some people before Plato taught. Some of them stated that principles of existing things are the hot and the cold, while others that they are the wet and the dry. One of them (stated that it is) Love and Victory¹³. Still, others (said) that it is One and Many¹⁴, or Even and Odd (number). This is Monad and Dyad, as the Pythagoreans said. All of them agreed that the First Principles were opposite to each other, though they differed (from each other) in that some of them considered them as secondary, some as primary, and some only as material.

§37 However, it also seems good to us that, when the First Principles are reduced to two and are thus opposed to each other, one of them is like an active one and the other is like one that is affected by it. But it is necessary that these principles not originate from something else or from each other. And two of them that are characterised as being in primary opposition, because they are primary, cannot originate from something else, and because they are opposed, they cannot originate from each other. Those opposites in each of them exist in them by accident, in that they are generated things. And consequently, they originate from each other, while the primary ones do not. For if they had come to be or are coming to be, they would no longer be primary in the proper sense.

§38 So, of two First Principles which are opposed to each other, as we said, one is active and the other is passive. The active one is God, and the passive one is Matter. And because He is the active (cause), it is necessary that He performs His actions in accordance with the Idea, Form, and Thought that are in Him. This made apparent to us that there is a third principle of existing things.

§39 These are, namely, the three First Principles of existing things: God, Matter, and First Ideas of existing things. God is the principle by which origin-

¹³ I.e. love and *strife*. The same misinterpretation of the Greek form *veĩkoç* as *vĩkoç* occurs in §13.

¹⁴ A commentary in the margin in the middle of the page: “The coming-to-be of something is the perishing of another, e.g. the death of wheat is the birth of an ear, and the death of a seed is the birth of a living being.”

ally something was acted. The First Idea is the principle after the likeness of which something which was acted was acted. And Matter is the principle out of which originally some activity acted.

(4. Definition of Matter)

§40 As these things have been defined in this way, first we will speak about Matter. That Matter is a principle seems good also to the Pythagoreans, to Socrates and Plato, to those who were after Plato, to the Stoics, and to Aristotle. Those who were after Plato called it “matter” (ὕλη).

§41 But it seems that Plato nowhere calls it “matter”, but uses other names for it, deriving some of them from the object itself, and others from affections in us. From the object itself, thus, he calls it the primary foundation, the first subject that is prior to all beings, or “all-receptive”¹⁵, or “mould” (ἐκμαρτεῖον)¹⁶, or “mother” and “receptacle of all beings” which is like a female¹⁷. He names it from the affections in us when he says that it is difficult to consider it in pure thought¹⁸.

§42 And the Stoics called it “substance” (οὐσία) and defined it as follows: substance is matter of everything. And in general, it is acknowledged by all of them that there is Matter which is passive and alterable and wholly and in all respects changeable. However, there is no unanimity on this question. For the Stoics consider (Matter) in the account of its essence to be changeable and becoming qualified, as nothing is associated with it, except in regard to how it exists. Thus, it should become apparent that quality is nothing else, except Matter. But in the way substance is, so is quality. And similarly about the rest.

§43 But it does not seem this way to us, for quality is not Matter. Rather, quality is an accident, while Matter is a subject in which an accident appears. It is called passive in the sense that it receives quality and through it becomes qualification. Those changes that occur in Matter are not its own, but are of the qualities in it. For if it were to be changeable in its essence, it might change into something else, (and) thus it would be necessary for the latter thing to exist. So, if it were to change in its essence into something else, it would cease to be Matter, which is impossible.

¹⁵ Plato, *Tim.* 51a7.

¹⁶ Plato, *Tim.* 50c2.

¹⁷ Plato, *Tim.* 51a4–5.

¹⁸ Plato, *Tim.* 52b2.

§44 Further, as in the case of the wax, while it changes in the shapes it receives, it does not depart totally from the faculty of its essence, but remains being wax, while the shapes in it change into one another, i.e. something that is not wax, and in this way is it said that wax is passible; so also in the case of Matter: while it constantly receives in itself various shapes and different qualities, it remains without change in its essence. It is in this way that we speak about passibility.

§45 Further, they say in general that it is unqualified, unspecified, (and) form(less)¹⁹ in its essence. Not as though there is a time when these (categories) are absent from it, but rather in the account of its essence it does not possess them, nor even a single particular quality. But even if in (our) intellect we differentiate it in its essence from qualities, we nonetheless say that it has them potentially.

§46 For there are two ways of saying that (something exists) potentially. One of them is when we say that in a seed there are principles of ears²⁰ that potentially come to be from it. Another is when something does not possess such principles in its essence, but may naturally receive them and be imprinted by them. It is stated that these exist potentially in it, just as forms and shapes are said to be potentially imprinted upon wax and brass.

§47 Now, if someone says according to the first meaning that Matter in itself potentially possesses qualities, and together with them also forms and shapes, so that all these appear from it and come to completion, then the active (cause) is not necessary for the constitution of the activity. But it is proper that there be an active (cause) together with Matter if an activity is to take place. And if in the second way we say that these exist potentially in it (i.e. Matter), then we also exclude the active (cause). But this is absurd and does not follow the reason.

§48 Further, both (meanings) have in common that it is necessary for Matter to be in every way eternal if it is a principle of existing things. For it is not a common (opinion) that it is finite. Because if it were, it would mean that

¹⁹ This seems to be the original meaning of the text, which in its present (probably corrupt) state may be translated as “of unspecified form”.

²⁰ Syriac text seems to be corrupt here. However, it is obvious that the author elaborates the Stoic idea of generative principles (λόγοι).

(Matter) were considered finite like some measurable and definable quantity. A measurable quantity is either like line, or like surface, or like bodies. But it is said to be finite (neither)²¹ like line nor like surface. What remains then is that it is like body. But if it is like body, then it also has shape. For the limit of a body is shape, and shape is one of the species of quality.

§49 If in this way Matter were finite, it would be qualified and formed in the account of its essence. But as they consider it to be without quality and without shape in the account of its essence, it is also obvious that it is not finite, but infinite. It is not said to be like something that has neither beginning nor end, but something that is able to receive a limit, yet which has not been limited in the account of its essence. Just as it is said to have no quality and no shape, in the same way it has no limit, like something that has not yet been limited.

§50 That there is something that underlies the four elements (στοιχεῖα) like the primary foundation which they call “matter” is obvious also from the transformation of the first bodies into one another, and from the changeability of the qualities.

§51 For, behold, earth has two qualities, dryness and coldness. Similarly, water has two qualities, wetness and coldness. Dryness is a peculiar characteristic of earth, and wetness is that of water, while coldness is a common characteristic of both bodies. Thus, when earth dissolves and transforms into water, its dryness is changed to wetness, while coldness, being the common characteristic, remains.

§52 And this (i.e. coldness) exists neither in earth anymore nor in water. It is not in earth because what has been transformed from earth is no longer earth. And neither is it water, because (water) has not yet come to be, but rather thus

21 The negative particle α is not in the ms., but this seems to be the original meaning of the text.

far appears as coming-to-be and has not yet become what is water. It follows, thus, that coldness has to be in something, for it is not able to appear without that which it is in. And this is nothing other than Matter, which is a necessary reason for it to exist.

§53 Further, we say that air also has two qualities, hotness and wetness. And it is also said that water possesses wetness and coldness. There is something that each one of them has specifically: it is coldness for water, and hotness for air, while wetness is what both of them have in common. When water is rarefied, is transformed, and becomes air, its coldness changes then into hotness, while its wetness remains without change. Then it (i.e. wetness) is not present (in water anymore), neither is it in something else. But as it must be in something, thus it is in Matter.

§54 In the same way, fire also possesses two qualities, hotness and dryness, while air has hotness and wetness. What both of them have in common is hotness, while wetness belongs specifically to air and dryness to fire. When air becomes hot and transforms into fire, wetness changes into dryness, while hotness, which is common (to both), neither exists nor is (any longer) present in any of them. As it cannot be present by itself, it is obvious that it is in Matter.

§55 It is therefore not unclear how from the transformations of the primary bodies into each other it is found that Matter is something fixed, a primary foundation of beings, all-receptive, a receptacle and a nurse of all beings, like a female²².

§56 It follows from this that we should consider whether Matter is embodied or not embodied. I state, namely, that it is not simply embodied, and neither is it unembodied, but rather it is potentially a body and something embodied.

§57 For that what is properly called body is composed of matter and quality. Therefore, it (i.e. Matter) is not a body. Further, there is no body which is not qualified. But Matter by its own definition has no quality. Therefore, it is not a

22 Cf. Plato, *Tim.* 51a4–5, 51a7, and 52d4–5.

f. 116v 𐤁𐤏𐤕 𐤏𐤓 𐤓𐤕𐤕 𐤓𐤕𐤕 | 𐤓𐤕𐤕 𐤓𐤕𐤕 𐤓𐤕𐤕
𐤓𐤕𐤕 𐤓𐤕𐤕 𐤓𐤕𐤕 𐤓𐤕𐤕 𐤓𐤕𐤕 𐤓𐤕𐤕 𐤓𐤕𐤕 𐤓𐤕𐤕 𐤓𐤕𐤕

§58 אחרי כן

1. **የጥንቃቄና የጥራት ማረጋገጫ**፡ ለሕግ አፈጻጸም የሚያስፈልጉትን ጥንቃቄና ጥራት ማረጋገጥ፡
 2. **የሰው ሀብት ጥበቃ**፡ ለሰው ሀብት ጥበቃና ለሰው ሀብት ጥበቃ የሚያስፈልጉትን ጥራት ማረጋገጥ፡
 3. **የጥራት ማረጋገጫ**፡ ለጥራት ማረጋገጫና ለጥራት ማረጋገጫ የሚያስፈልጉትን ጥራት ማረጋገጥ፡
 4. **የጥራት ማረጋገጫ**፡ ለጥራት ማረጋገጫና ለጥራት ማረጋገጫ የሚያስፈልጉትን ጥራት ማረጋገጥ፡
 5. **የጥራት ማረጋገጫ**፡ ለጥራት ማረጋገጫና ለጥራት ማረጋገጫ የሚያስፈልጉትን ጥራት ማረጋገጥ፡
 6. **የጥራት ማረጋገጫ**፡ ለጥራት ማረጋገጫና ለጥራት ማረጋገጫ የሚያስፈልጉትን ጥራት ማረጋገጥ፡
 7. **የጥራት ማረጋገጫ**፡ ለጥራት ማረጋገጫና ለጥራት ማረጋገጫ የሚያስፈልጉትን ጥራት ማረጋገጥ፡
 8. **የጥራት ማረጋገጫ**፡ ለጥራት ማረጋገጫና ለጥራት ማረጋገጫ የሚያስፈልጉትን ጥራት ማረጋገጥ፡
 9. **የጥራት ማረጋገጫ**፡ ለጥራት ማረጋገጫና ለጥራት ማረጋገጫ የሚያስፈልጉትን ጥራት ማረጋገጥ፡
 10. **የጥራት ማረጋገጫ**፡ ለጥራት ማረጋገጫና ለጥራት ማረጋገጫ የሚያስፈልጉትን ጥራት ማረጋገጥ፡

[illegible][illegible]

පාඨකයා : ඔබ, තමන්ගේ ජීවිතයේ සියලුම අත්දැකීම් පාඨකයාට \$60

[illegible]

§61

20 .ကမ္ဘာလ ကမ္ဘာလ ကမ္ဘာလ ကမ္ဘာလ

[illegible][illegible]

നമുക്കു നല്ല കാര്യം വന്നു, നമ്മുടെ ദൈവത്തിന് നന്ദി പറയുക §63

[illegible]

body. Further, similarly, every body has limits and boundaries. But Matter by its definition has no limits and boundaries. Therefore, it is not a body.

§58 Further, it is said about bodies that they are compounded by the first genera of categories. Thus, it is through substance (οὐσία) that they become receptive to all kinds of opposition. And quantity and amount are that through which they are three-dimensional. It is qualification that makes them partakers in quality. To be big or small is possible through relatives. And similarly with other categories. However, we deprive it (i.e. Matter) from all of them.

§59 Further, of something passive we may speak in two ways: one is (to say) that its essence transforms and changes, and another is that its essence does not transform or change, but it is called passive because it is receptive to something that transforms and changes — and Matter is like this.

§60 Further, just as the primary active thing is not a genus and does not fall under any genus, likewise the primary passive thing, which is a principle, also does not fall under any genus. Matter is also like this, and on that account, if it is a principle, like a principle it does not need to have an aim prior to itself, a certain genus before it, as likewise there is nothing that can be predicated of it. If it is like that, then it is not a body.

§61 Further, every body is perceptible. But Matter is not perceptible. Therefore, it is not a body.

§62 Further, Matter is something simple and not compound. A body is not simple, but compound. Therefore, it is not a body.

§63 Further, if Matter were a body, it would have the definition of a body, that is, it would have three dimensions, or it could be divided three-dimensionally and have resistance. But Matter does not have these, otherwise it too would be

quantified and qualified, but all this does not belong to the account of its essence. Therefore, it is not a body.

§64 However, neither is it incorporeal. For a non-body does not transform to become a body. But when Matter receives forms, it becomes a body in actuality. Therefore, it is not incorporeal.

§65 Further, if it were a body, it would be manifested to “belief supported by unreasoned sensation”²³. But it is not like this. Therefore, it is not a body.

§66 And if it were incorporeal, it would be comprehensible and intelligible by intellect or by “thought with the support of a reasoned account”²⁴. But it is not like this. Therefore, it is not incorporeal.

§67 Hence, we properly say that it is not simply corporeal, neither is it incorporeal, but rather it is potentially embodied and a body. And what is said to be in potentiality is capable of being. But what is capable of being is not yet there, and therefore it is said of it that it is associated with imperceptibility and that it may hardly be considered in pure thought²⁵. These things which we have gathered concerning Matter may (here) come to an end for us.

(5. Plato’s Concept of First Principles and Matter)

§68 Through these things which have been said clearly and very systematically, we stated the reason for Matter being necessary, which is derived from the concept of the transformation of the primary bodies into each other. It was also told how Plato counted it to be an ungenerated principle and, further, to be simple and unqualified in the account of its essence.

§69 And for this reason, it is not a body, but a body in potentiality. And for this reason, it is also incorporeal. Neither is it generated, but it is a principle of generated things. Further, it is impassible, but is receptive of faculties that are affected in it. Further, it is unchangeable, imperishable, and unalterable, being like a mother, like a female and a receptacle of all things like this²⁶.

²³ Plato, *Tim.* 28a2–3.

²⁴ Plato, *Tim.* 28a1–2.

²⁵ Cf. Plato, *Tim.* 28a, 51a–b and 52b.

²⁶ Cf. §§ 41 and 55, above.

§70 And therefore, while it remains in its essence, it receives everything, like the primary foundation and a receptacle of all beings, and it may hardly be grasped in pure thought. And besides being imperceptible, it is changeable. It is everything in potentiality, for it may naturally receive all qualities, shapes, and measures.

§71 And further, it is infinite, not as something that has neither beginning nor end, i.e. as something which is able to have limits but has not yet received a limit in its notion. Neither is it divided to infinity or infinitely in the account of its essence. Also, it is neither great nor small.

§72 And the reason was explained as to why it is established as ungenerated. For, being a principle, it may come to be neither from something else, nor from God, who is its opposite, and it is his, so that both of them are primary opposites. And the primary opposites cannot come to be from one another, no from other things, because they are primary.

§73 Now, Atticus, in the first treatise on the teachings of Plato, sets out in the following concise and summary fashion the doctrine of Plato concerning First Principles:

“By exact definition, they are divided into four principles: the one that is the Father and Creator of everything; the other that is the Form and Idea, according to which he formed everything; then Matter, which is receptive to all beings; and movability, or motion, which co-existed with Matter (and) which moves by itself. That which moves by itself he calls ‘Soul’.

§74 It is also permitted, he says, to divide the principles into two, the active cause and the passive one. Each of them may be further divided into two: (the first one) into the active cause and the Form; and the passive (cause) we may divide into Matter and Soul, which is moved by itself. If one would leave the first division undivided, but divide the other one, likewise in this way three principles would be stated.

§75 Some people do not comprehend that Plato also puts Soul among the First Principles, and thus he set three principles: Matter, God, and Form.

But it does not seem that he postulates this. For he says: ‘Taking over all existing things, which were in a discordant and disorderly state, God brought them to order from disorder’²⁷. It is clear, then, from the words of Plato that Matter, which (God) took over, was neither unmovable nor unqualified.

§76 For Plato also demonstrates everywhere that Soul is a source and principle of every sort of movability in all things. From this follows that the discordance and disorder which were in Matter from the beginning were from irrational Soul, which at that time was in Matter as a First Principle. And if one agrees to call both of them ‘matter’, because Soul and what is properly called Matter were unseparated from each other, then it is clear that it is right to speak in this way about three Principles.

§77 Now, all those, who unite God and Form and make a distinction between Matter and Soul, should be considered those who especially follow Plato’s opinion. For he wrote thus in the *Timaeus*: ‘There were three things, being, place, and coming-to-be, three in threefold way, before the heavens came to be’²⁸. He calls ‘being’ everything that exists without coming-to-be and corruption and that firmly remains the same. That is how the primary God and the universal Form are defined and exist.

§78 He calls Matter ‘place’. He referred to it by this term, alongside others, for until then the name ‘matter’ had not been fixed upon the substance (οὐσία) which as the primary foundation underlies all beings. He calls ‘coming-to-be’ the principle of every generation and the primary movement, and this movement, he says, is (due to)²⁹ Soul.

§79 He also says that these things are formed in agreement with and in adherence to the primary design. It is thus necessary that we conclude that everything that exists beautifully has a creator. And it is necessary that the one who creates everything beautifully should also have some

²⁷ Plato, *Tim.* 30a3–6. The Syriac text omits the word ὁπαρὸν. Cf. another rendering of the same passage in §85.

²⁸ Plato, *Tim.* 52d2–4.

²⁹ Ms. is barely readable at this place, however it is evident that the word ܡܝܬܝܬܝܬ has some prefix and it is most likely ܡܝܬܝܬܝܬ.

1. **הקדמה:** מטרת המחקר היא להבין את תהליכי התפתחות המערכת.
 2. **מטודות:** נעשה שימוש בשיטות כמותיות וקוואליטטיביות.
 3. **תוצאות:** התגלו קשרים משמעותיים בין המשתנים.
 4. **מסקנות:** המחקר מצביע על הצורך בהתערבות.
 5. **המלצות:** נדרש מחקר נוסף בתחום זה.

5 താമര നമ്പി താലൂക്കിലെ ഒരു മതി താമര വെട്ടി നൽകിയിരിക്കുന്നു §80

අපගේ මෙම ප්‍රකාශන අපේ මනසේ ඇති සියලුම සිතියම් සහ සිතියම්
 අපේ මනසේ ඇති සියලුම සිතියම් සහ සිතියම්
 අපේ මනසේ ඇති සියලුම සිතියම් සහ සිතියම්
 අපේ මනසේ ඇති සියලුම සිතියම් සහ සිතියම්

[illegible]

1. අනුමැතිය ලබාදීම සඳහා අවශ්‍ය වන සියලුම පියවරන්
 2. අනුමැතිය ලබාදීම සඳහා අවශ්‍ය වන සියලුම පියවරන්
 3. අනුමැතිය ලබාදීම සඳහා අවශ්‍ය වන සියලුම පියවරන්
 4. අනුමැතිය ලබාදීම සඳහා අවශ්‍ය වන සියලුම පියවරන්
 5. අනුමැතිය ලබාදීම සඳහා අවශ්‍ය වන සියලුම පියවරන්

15 אֲנִי חָפֵץ בְּחַיֵּי הַיָּמִים הַלֵּלוּ. וְלֹא יִשְׁכַּח לִי הַיָּמִים הַלֵּלוּ. §82

[illegible]

f. 99r §83

[illegible]

idea upon which and through which he would gaze, and according to which he would create everything. For if he does not foreknow and foresee in what way something should come to be which will beautifully come to be, he will not be able to start his work properly.

§80 And if there is the one who creates, it is by all means necessary that there is also that which comes to be, is created, and formed. But it is also necessary that God have a certain movement through the gazing at which he creates, especially when the primary generative causes are motionless and thus remain the same. For it is impossible that a structure which is in motion should appear from the primary things which are motionless.

§81 According to Plato's view, Matter is incorporeal and unqualified when everything that exists in it is removed from it. But because of its association with quality, which it acquires, and of its potential ability to (acquire) it, Plato calls it in various ways, i.e. 'receptacle', 'exact foundation', 'mother', 'female', 'all-receptive', 'manifestator', 'space', and 'place'.

§82 Some also say that, though he in this way states that it is unqualified, yet he never says that it is without quality. For because Soul, which is moved by itself, is constantly in it, it is necessary that it be also moved. Thus, the ability of Matter to be moved allows it to receive quality. For even in space no movement may occur unless those things that are moved should properly possess some limit and shapes. Since these things are associated with and belong to Matter, it may no longer remain in its proper condition.

§83 Now, it seems necessary to take a comprehensive explanation concerning Matter also from the ability of the primary bodies to transform into one another. For when a quality changes, the first quality is not naturally able to receive in itself the second quality. Therefore, it is necessary that there should be something receptive to both of them, and this

will be at one moment one thing and at another moment something else, according to the changing qualities it receives.”³⁰

§84 Now, Atticus, who follows Plutarch, also states that the nature of Soul is ungenerated, unordered, and unformed, and that it appeared by itself from eternity and came together with Matter. And because it exists naturally with Matter, is set in order, and imitates the First Forms and Ideas which are in God, also Matter is set in order by God.

§85 There is a difficult and irresolvable problem regarding how Matter partook of the First Ideas. It may be easily solved by the following argument. For it was said by Plato that when God brought forth “all that is visible, he gave it not in a state of rest but moving in a discordant and disorderly manner, and he brought it to order from disorder”³¹.

§86 While they (i.e. Atticus and Plutarch) assume that Matter possesses movement due to the discordant motion of Soul that is in it, they completely fail to differentiate (two things): one thing is the constitution of the world, and another is that of the bodies. For the constitution of the world as world has primary bodies as principles, while that of bodies as bodies has matter, form, and shapes. So, they assume that the words which Plato uttered about the constitution of the world refer to the constitution of bodies. And they and those who followed them were sized by great error, following opinions that are foreign to Plato’s aim.

§87 Instead, when in regard to these matters we start to do inquiry among (different) opinions, we discern more exactly how Severus interpreted this utterance of Plato. Now, in the first treatise which he wrote on the questions concerning Plato’s *Timaeus*³², when Severus was explaining what it was about which Plato said that it was moving in an unordered way before the generation of the world, and from what kind of disorder to what kind of order it was brought by God, he said:

30 It is not clear where the quotation from Atticus ends. It is possible that §83 does not belong to it, but should be rather considered a commentary of the author of the treatise (i.e. Porphyry) on Atticus’ words.

31 Plato, *Tim.* 30a3–6.

32 The text of the manuscript is corrupt. Literally: “in the first treatise concerning those things which Plato has accomplished to Timotheus”. The last form is an evident corruption of *Timaeus*.

§88 “Now, it is necessary to understand what the philosopher did in this place, i.e. from the beginning of the passage on nature until that one which is called ‘generation of Soul’. Had not he (i.e. God) established the corporeal world in his mind? But behold, does it not seem that he creates this (world) in a different manner? Does he not compose it from the four bodies? But it is evident that the way of understanding this, which we should follow, is that these four bodies existed prior to this (world).

§89 Were they there ordered or disordered? But to say that they were ordered would not be correct. For if they were ordered, then the world would have been that which is composed of these ordered things. But it is a fallacy to think that there was a world before the generation of this world, which came to be from it. Then it remains that we think that the four bodies were from the beginning moving disorderly. That means that they accomplished their motion without order and that they were not settled. And they also have not brought about the world from their movability.

§90 The disorder in them should be understood as privation of order, as if they have yet partaken neither in the order which was due to them and to the world nor in the disturbance and confusion which are contrary to order in potentiality and in kind and which are the beginning of evil. But because in the words after that he (i.e. Plato) speaks about Matter and also about the constitution of bodies, he says that they were moving disorderly.

§91 Now, we must understand that all those things that are said by the way of privation and negation — e.g., ‘unattractive’, ‘unseen’, ‘unordered’, and all the like — either signify to a greater extent something contrary or that which is intermediate to the extremes. Thus, when we say ‘unattractive’, sometimes we denote the ugly, and sometimes the intermediate to the ugly and the beautiful.

§92 Similarly with the terms ‘unseen’ and ‘unordered’, we do not always designate the contrary or the opposite, but sometimes the intermediate to them. For when a bunch of plants is intended to be planted in some order,

we also call them unordered, not because they possess disturbance and confusion, but because they do not yet possess the order which they acquire when being planted.

§93 Therefore, these four bodies were moving disorderly in such a sense that they had not yet acquired the necessary order which makes up the world.”

§94 With these (arguments) Severus precisely explained this passage, having shown that with these words Plato did not refer to Matter, and certainly not to the state of bodies, but rather to the formation and setting in order of the world from bodies. This is how it comes that we say that the opinion concerning the constitution of the world as world is one thing, and that concerning the constitution of the bodies as bodies from which the world appeared is another.

§95 Our teacher Plotinus also shared this view, when he interpreted the *Timaeus*. Boethus, instead, who was followed by our teacher Longinus, thought that these words of Plato refer to Matter while he was explaining why Plato provided Matter with movability rather than with immovability and attributed creation to God.

§96 Giving a reason (for this) he (i.e. Boethus) says:

“Something cannot be affected by something else unless it also possesses some motion of its own. We are even unable to deliver a statement (ἀξιωμα) about similar things, if they do not possess a movement of their own. For it is possible to throw a stone up, but by itself it will fall down towards the centre.”

§97 That’s why, he says³³, Matter would have never been able to be moved by God unless there was some movability in itself, so that God could have formed it and set in order. Therefore, it seems also that, according to the opinion of Plato, he gave natural motion to Matter, for without it, it would have not been possible to utilise it for creation.

33 It is possible that the last paragraph also belongs to the quotation from Boethus. In this case, “he” would refer to Plato.

Syriac and Greek Glossary

Given the fact that no Greek original for the Syriac translation has been found thus far, we have no direct basis for comparison between the Syriac and Greek terminology. Thus, the Greek terms in the following glossary should not be taken as actual equivalents to the Syriac ones, but rather as hypothetical variants that derive from the extant Syriac translations of Greek philosophical and scientific works.

Following published glossaries of the Syriac translation of Greek philosophical texts have been consulted:

DeM	<i>De Mundo</i> : Adam McCollum, <i>A Greek and Syriac Index to Sergius of Reshaina's Version of the De Mundo</i> (Gorgias Handbooks, 12; Piscataway: Gorgias, 2009).
DeV	<i>De Virtutibus et vitiis</i> : Sebastian P. Brock, "An Abbreviated Syriac Version of Ps.-Aristotle, <i>De Virtutibus et vitiis</i> and <i>Divisiones</i> ", in: E. Coda & C. Martini Bonadeo (eds.), <i>De l'Antiquité tardive au Moyen Age: Mélanges offertes à Henri Hugonnard-Roche</i> (Études Musulmanes, 44; Paris: Vrin, 2014), 91–112.
HippAph	<i>Aphorismi Hippocratis</i> : Henri Pognon, <i>Une version syriaque des aphorismes d'Hippocrate</i> (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1903).
Hof	Johann G.E. Hoffmann, <i>De Hermeneuticis apud Syros Aristoteleis</i> (Leipzig, 1869).
Pol	Isidor Pollak, <i>Die Hermeneutik des Aristoteles in der arabischen Übersetzung des Ishak ibn Honain</i> (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, XIII.1; Leipzig, 1913).
SRInt	<i>Sergius of Reshaina, Introduction to Aristotle and his Categories</i> : Sami Aydin (ed.), <i>Sergius of Reshaina, Introduction to Aristotle and his Categories, Addressed to Philotheos: Syriac Text, with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary</i> (Aristoteles Semitico-Latinus, 24; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2016).

Additionally, the following Syriac translations from the Greek were analysed on the basis of the online editions in the HUNAYNNET database¹:

AnPrG	Aristotle, <i>Analytica Priora</i> , translation of George of the Arabs (ed. HUNAYNNET, based on the collation of cod. and the edition of Furlani);
-------	---

¹ <<https://hunaynnet.oeaw.ac.at/>>

AnPrP	Aristotle, <i>Analytica Priora</i> , translation of Proba (critical edition of HUNAYNNET);
CatAn	Aristotle, <i>Catogories</i> , anonymous translation (critical edition of HUNAYNNET);
CatG	Aristotle, <i>Categories</i> , translation of George of the Arabs (ed. HUNAYNNET, based on the collation of cod. and the edition of Furlani);
CatJ	Aristotle, <i>Categories</i> , translation of Jacob of Edessa (critical edition of HUNAYNNET);
DeInAn	Aristotle, <i>De Interpretatione</i> , anonymous translation (ed. HUNAYNNET, based on the edition of Hoffmann);
DeInG	Aristotle, <i>De Interpretatione</i> , translation of George of the Arabs (ed. HUNAYNNET, based on the collation of cod. and the edition of Furlani);
DeSim	<i>De Simplicium medicamentorum temperamentis et facultatibus</i> , liber VI (ed. HUNAYNNET, based on the edition prepared within the project “The Syriac Galen Palimpsest: Galen’s On Simple Drugs and the Recovery of Lost Texts through Sophisticated Imaging Techniques” at the University of Manchester);
IsagAn	Porphyry, <i>Isagoge</i> , anonymous translation (ed. HUNAYNNET, based on the edition of Brock);
IsagAth	Porphyry, <i>Isagoge</i> , translation of Athanasius of Balad (critical edition of HUNAYNNET).

Two Greek texts may be considered as containing close parallels to the Syriac:

Pl. <i>Tim.</i>	Plato, <i>Timaeus</i> ;
SextEmp	Sextus Empiricus, <i>Adv. Math.</i> , Book X.

In two cases, no references to the extant Syriac translations from the Greek appear near the Greek equivalents: (1) by loanwords from the Greek (then the sign “<” is applied), (2) when a term is not attested in the Syriac translations listed above, but is reconstructed with a high degree of probability (the presumed Greek equivalents were suggested by the editor by means of the sign “≈”):

<	Greek source of the Syriac loanword;
≈	presumed Greek equivalent, not attested in the extant sources.

The following glossary contains lexemes, which belong to philosophical and scientific terminology². It includes nouns, adjectives, verbs, and adverbs, but also some prepositions and pronouns, which assume terminological meaning. Prefixes, suffixes, and most of the pronouns, prepositions, and conjunctions are excluded.

² For the definition of philosophical and scientific terminology, cf. Leicht & Veltri, “The Study of Pre-Modern Philosophical and Scientific Hebrew Terminology”.

The Syriac glossary is organized according to Syriac roots, established on the basis of Sokoloff's lexicon³.

References are to the paragraph numbers of the Syriac edition published in the present volume.

³ Sokoloff, *A Syriac Lexicon*. Cf. Kindt et al., “La concordance bilingue grecque-syriaque”.

Syriac Glossary



ʾr		
ܐܪ	§7, 13, 21–23, 35, 52, 54	< ἀήρ
ʾbʾ		
ܐܒܐ	§6, 73	πατήρ (IsagAn)
ʾbd		
ܐܒܕܐ	§34	≈ ἀπώλεια
ʾdšʾ		
ܐܕܫܐ	§5, 11, 14, 17, 23–26, 47, 48, 64, 84, 86	< εἶδος; ἰδέα (DeM)
ܐܕܫܐ ܐܕܫܐ	§45	≈ ἀνείδεος
ʾwsyʾ		
ܐܘܣܝܐ	§15, 42, 58, 78	< οὐσία
ʾhd		
ܐܘܕܝܬܐ <i>Ethpe.</i>	§86	ἐπιλαμβάνομαι (DeSim)
ʾhr		
ܐܝܪܐ	§17, 20	ὑστερος, ὕστατος (IsagAn, IsagAth), τελευταῖος (AnPrG)
ܐܝܪܐ	§10, 17, 33, 34, 36, 37, 41–44, 46, 58, 59, 72–74, 78, 83, 86, 94, 96	ἄλλος (IsagAn, IsagAth, DeInG), ἄλλοιόω (CatG)
ܕܐܝܪܐ	§3	τελευταῖον (IsagAn), ὕστερον (IsagAn)
ܕܐܝܪܐܐ	§88	ἄλλως (IsagAn, IsagAth), ἐτέρως (DeM)
ʾydʾ		
ܐܕܐ	§17, 24, 68, 84, 94	διά <i>c. gen.</i> (IsagAn, IsagAth, CatAn, etc.), κατά <i>c. acc.</i> (IsagAn, CatAn)
ʾyk		
ܐܝܟܐ ܐܝܟܐ	§21, 79	οἶον (CatAn, CatJ, CatG, etc.)
ܐܝܟܐ ܐܝܟܐ	§4, 26, 31	τοιούτος (IsagAth, DeInG, AnPrP)
ܐܝܟܐܐ	§27, 73, 79	
ʾyn		
ܐܝܢܐ (<i>f. ܐܝܢܐ</i>)	§79, 87	ποιός (CatAn, IsagAn, IsagAth), οἶον (Hof, DeInG)
ܐܝܢܐ ܐܝܢܐ	§58	κατὰ μέρος (IsagAn)

'yt ܝܬ	§1, 3–5, 7–15, 17–40, 42–73, 75–84, 86, 88–91, 96, 97	εἰμί (DeInAn, DeInG); ἔχω (DeInG); ὑπάρχω (Hof, DeInG)
ܡܐܕܝܬܐ	§77	τὸ ὄν (Pl. <i>Tim.</i>)
ܚܕܐܕܝܬܐ	§4	ἕξις (CatAn)
ܕܠ	§11, 22, 24, 34, 37, 45, 57, 71	οὐκ εἰμί (IsagAn, DeInAn, DeInG), μὴ ὑπάρχω (AnPrP)
'khd ܚܝܬܐ	§19, 73	συν- and προσ- in composite words (Hof); ἅμα (DeM, IsagAn, DeInG, etc.); πᾶν (DeInG)
'ksywm' ܚܝܝܡܐ	§96	< ἀξίωμα
'lh ܠܗ	§6, 15, 38, 39, 72, 75–77, 80, 84, 85, 87, 95, 97	θεός (Pl. <i>Tim.</i>)
'ls ܠܝܬܐ	§18, 19, 32, 33, 38, 82, 88	ἀνάγκη (DeM, IsagAn, AnPrP), ἀναγκαῖος (CatAn, IsagAn)
'm' ܡܬܐ	§41, 69, 81	μήτηρ (Pl. <i>Tim.</i>)
'mn ܡܢܐ	§11	συνεχής (DeM)
ܕܡܢܐ	§19, 77, 82	συνεχής (CatAn, AnPrG, DeM), συνεχῶς (DeM), αἰεί (IsagAth)
'mr ܡܪܐ	§1–6, 8–16, 18, 23, 25, 28, 32, 33, 35, 36, 38, 40–42, 45, 47, 52, 53, 56, 67, 68, 74, 75, 78, 79, 82, 87, 89–92, 94–97	λέγω (Hof, DeInG, AnPrP, etc.)
ܡܪܐ ܕܝܬܝܥܐ <i>Ethpe.</i>	§30, 35, 43, 44, 46, 48, 49, 58, 59, 67, 68, 71, 74, 76, 85, 86, 91	λέγομαι (IsagAn, IsagAth, AnPrP, etc.)
ܚܠܝܬܐ	§73, 87	λόγος (DeInAn, AnPrP), ῥῆμα (DeInG)

'n		
ܢ	§18, 19, 30–33, 35, 37, 42, 43, 45, 47–49, 52, 53, 60, 62, 63, 65, 66, 74, 76, 79, 82, 89, 96, 97	εἰ (IsagAn, IsagAth, CatAn, etc.), ἐπεὶ (IsagAn, CatAn)
'nnq'		
ܢܢܩ	§2, 23, 68	< ἀνάγκη
'nš'		
ܢܝܫ	§6, 18, 33, 35, 36, 47, 74–76	τίς (DeM, DeInG), ἄνθρωπος (CatAn)
'stwks'		
ܢܫܬܘܟܝܬܐ	§4, 35, 50	< στοιχεῖον
'skm'		
ܢܫܟܡܐ	§11, 12, 14, 23, 25, 26, 44–49, 70, 82, 86	< σχῆμα
ܢܫܟܡܬܐ	§49	≈ ἐσχηματισμένος
'sr		
ܢܫܪܝܬܐ	§92	≈ δεσμός
'pzg'		
ܢܫܝܕܐ	§36	≈ ἄνισος
'qm'gwn		
ܢܩܡܓܘܢ	§41	< ἐκμαγεῖον
'r'		
ܢܪܐ	§88	< ἄρα
'rb'		
ܢܪܒܐ	§1, 13, 50, 73, 88, 89, 93	τέσσαρες (IsagAn, IsagAth, DeInAn, etc.), τέταρτος (CatJ, DeSim)
'r ^o		
ܢܪܐܝܐ	§13, 21–23, 35, 51, 52	γῆ (DeM)
ܢܪܐܝܐܝܐ	§22	χθόνιος (DeM)
'šd		
ܢܫܕܐ <i>Ethpe.</i>	§51	ἀναχεῖται (DeM)
'št'		
ܢܫܬܐ	§81	
ܢܫܬܐܢܬܐ	§41, 50, 55, 70, 78	στοιχεῖωσις (DeSim)
'ty		
ܢܬܐ	§47	εἰμί (DeInAn), ἦκω (DeSim)
ܢܬܐܐܢܐ <i>Af.</i>	§75, 85	ἄγω (Pl. <i>Tim.</i>)
ܢܬܐܬܐܢܐ <i>Ettaf.</i>	§87	προσέρχομαι (IsagAth)

'tr'		
ܬܪܝܬܐ	§81, 82	χώρα (DeM, DeSim), τόπος (CatJ, CatG, DeM)

ܐ

bṭl		
ܬܠܐ <i>Pa.</i>	§8	ἀναιρέω (CatAn), συναναιρέω (IsagAn, CatAn)
bwr		
ܬܠܝܐܐ	§89	≈ μωρία
byš		
ܬܠܝܫܐ	§90	τὸ κακόν (CatAn)
byt'		
ܬܠܝܬܐ	§16, 36, 40, 96, 97	≈ οἶκος, οἰκεῖος
ܬܠܝܬܐ	§82, 96	οἰκεῖος (CatJ, CatG, IntG, IsagAth)
ܬܠܝܬܐ	§82	οἰκείως (CatJ, CatG)
bll		
ܬܠܠܐ	§86	≈ πλημμελής
ܬܠܠܐ	§25, 75, 85	πλημμελῶς (Pl. <i>Tim.</i>)
ܬܠܠܐ	§76, 90, 92	
bl'd		
ܬܠܕܐ	§22, 26, 52, 82, 97	χωρίς (DeM), ἄνευ (IsagAn, CatAn, DeInG)
b'y		
ܬܠܝܬܐ <i>Ethpe.</i>	§60, 79	ζητοῦμαι (AnPrG)
ܬܠܝܬܐ	§33, 85	ἀπορία (SRInt)
bšr		
ܬܠܝܬܐ	§36, 37, 71	ἥττον (IsagAn, IsagAth, CatAn)
ܬܠܝܬܐ	§45	ἥττον (IsagAn, IsagAth, CatJ)
br'		
ܬܠܝܬܐ	§42	παρά <i>c. acc.</i> (CatJ), ἐκτός <i>c. gen.</i> (DeInAn, DeInG)
btr		
ܬܠܝܬܐ	§24, 29, 35, 40, 90	μετά <i>c. acc.</i> (CatAn, CatJ, CatG, etc.), ἐξῆς <i>c. gen.</i> (DeM)
ܬܠܝܬܐ	§12	εἴτα (CatAn, DeInAn, DeInG, etc.), ἔπειτα (DeInAn, DeInG, DeSim)

ܐ

gdš

ܓܕܫ

§3, 4, 31, 34, 43, 76

συμβαίνω (CatAn, CatJ, CatG, etc.);
τὸ συμβεβηκός (CatAn, CatJ, CatG)
κατα συμβεβηκός (DeInAn, DeSim)

ܕܓܕܫ

§37

gw'

ܓܘ

§48, 51, 54

κοινός (IsagAn, CatAn, CatJ, CatG),
καθόλου (DeInAn, DeSim, SRInt)

ܓܘܐ

§77

κοινός (CatJ), καθόλου (DeInAn)

ܕܓܘܐ

§42, 45, 53

ἀπλῶς (Hof, AnPrP), κοινός (IsagAn,
IsagAth, CatAn, CatJ), κοινῶς
(IsagAn), καθόλου (IsagAn, DeSim)

gwn

ܓܘܢ

§9, 60, 67, 70

διό (IsagAn, IsagAth), ὥστε (IsagAn)

glz

ܓܠܝܬܐ *Ethpe.*

§4

στεροῦμαι (Hof, CatAn, CatJ, etc.)

ܓܠܝܬܐ

§14, 90, 91

στέρησις (CatAn, CatJ, CatG)

gmr

ܓܡܪ

§34

τελέως (DeSim)

gns'

ܓܢܝ

§11, 58, 60

< γένος

gšm

ܓܫܡ

§14, 23, 48, 50, 51, 55–
58, 60–65, 67–69, 83,
86, 88–90, 93, 94

σῶμα (IsagAn, IsagAth, CatAn, etc.)

ܓܫܡܐ

§56, 64, 67, 88

≈ σωματωθεῖσα (sc. ἡ ὕλη)

ܓܫܡܐ ܕ

§56, 64, 66, 67, 69, 81

≈ ἀσώματος

ܐ

dbq

ܕܒܩ

§12

κολλάω (DeSim)

dwk

ܕܘܟܠܐ

§76

πανταχοῦ (DeInG)

ܕܘܟܠܐ ܕ

§41

≈ μηδαμοῦ

ܕܘܟܠܐ

§77, 78, 81, 88, 94

τόπος (IsagAth, CatAn), χώρα
(Pl. *Tim.*)

dyl		
ܕܝܠ	§23, 43, 57, 72	αὐτός (DeInAn, DeInG), τὸ ἴδιον (IsagAn)
ܕܝܠܝܢܐ	§17, 35	τὸ ἴδιον (IsagAn, IsagAth, CatAn, etc.), ιδιότης (IsagAn, IsagAth)
ܕܝܠܝܢܐ	§45, 45	ἴδιος (CatAn, CatJ, CatG, etc.), ιδικός (Hof)
dll		
ܕܠܝܠܐ <i>Ethpa.</i>	§53	ἀραιοῦμαι (DeM)
dmy		
ܕܡܝܐ	§12	ἕοικα (IsagAn, IsagAth, CatAn, etc.), ὅμοιος (CatJ)
ܕܡܝܠܐ <i>Ethpa.</i>	§84	
ܕܡܝܠܐܡܝܐ	§10	≈ ὁμοιομερής
ܕܡܝܠܐܡܝܐ	§84	≈ ὁμοιοειδής
ܕܡܝܠܐܡܝܐ	§27, 73, 74–77	μορφή (CatJ, CatAn)
ܕܡܝܠܐܡܝܐ	§23, 27, 28, 38, 39, 42, 54	ὁμοίως (DeInAn, DeInG, AnPrP, etc.), ὡσαύτως (CatAn)
drk		
ܕܪܝܠܐ	§66	

ܡ

h'		
ܡܡ	§51, 88	ἤδη (Hof)
hwy		
ܡܡܐ	§3–6, 13, 17–19, 21, 28–37, 39, 42, 46–48, 52, 53, 64, 67–69, 72, 73, 75–80, 82–85, 87–90, 93, 94, 96, 97	εἰμί (IsagAn, IsagAth, CatAn, etc.), γίγνομαι (Pl. <i>Tim.</i> , CatAn, DeSim), ὑπάρχω (AnPrP)
ܡܡܐ	§8, 10, 11, 19, 35, 43, 52, 77, 78, 87, 89	γένεσις (Pl. <i>Tim.</i> ; CatAn, CatJ)
ܡܡܐ ܡܠܐ	§84	≈ ἀγέννητος
ܡܡܐ	§6, 28, 33, 35–37, 39, 41, 48, 55, 69, 70, 73, 78	τὰ ὄντα (DeM), τὰ γενόμενα (Pol)
hwl'		
ܡܡܐ	§9, 14, 15, 24, 25, 28, 38–44, 47–50, 52–57,	< ὕλη

	60–64, 67, 68, 73–76, 78, 81–88, 90, 94, 95, 97	
ܪܠܐܡ	§24, 36	< ὑλικός
ܪܠܠܐܡ	§3, 4, 6, 7, 10	ἐνυλος (SRInt)
hwn'		
ܪܡܡ	§10, 26, 27, 66	νοῦς (Hof, DeM)
hymn		
ܚܡܢܝܬܐ <i>QuadRef.</i>	§67	≈ πιστεύω (cf. ܚܡܢ in DeM)
hkyl		
ܚܠܠܐܡ	§6, 18, 29, 35, 42, 47, 51, 52, 55, 79, 87–89, 91, 93, 97	οὖν (CatAn, CatJ, CatG, etc.)
ܚܠܠܐ	§33, 49, 52, 67, 71, 78, 90	ἐτι (DeSim)
ܚܠܠܐ ܪ	§52, 92, 93	οὐπω (CatAn, CatJ, DeInAn, etc.), οὐδέπω (CatJ, CatG)
hrysys		
ܚܪܝܣܝܣ	§2	< αἵρεσις
hš'		
ܚܫܐܡ	§17, 83	νῦν (IsagAn, IsagAth, CatJ, etc.)
ܐ		
wrđ		
ܪܠܝܐ	§22	φλέψ (DeSim, HippAph), φλέβιον (HippAph)
ܝ		
zbn		
ܪܒܐ	§30, 32, 45, 92	χρόνος (CatAn, DeInAn, DeInG, etc.), καιρός (DeM)
ܪܒܐ ܚܕܐ ... ܪܒܐ ܝܬܝܐ	§91	ὅτε μὲν ... ὅτε δέ (DeInAn, DeInG)
zdq		
ܪܕܐ	§17, 25, 30, 32, 33, 36, 37, 43, 47, 48, 53, 79, 80, 83, 90, 91	δεῖ (IsagAn, IsagAth, CatAn, etc.)
ܪܕܐܝܐ	§35, 67	εἰκότως (DeSim, CatJ, CatG)

zwʿ

ܠܝܬܬܦܗ *Ettaph.*§12, 26, 73, 74, 82, 85,
87, 89, 90, 93, 97κινουμαι (IsagAn, IsagAth, DeM,
etc.)

ܠܝܬܬܦܗܐ

§1, 80

κινήτος (DeInAn, DeInG)

ܠܝܬܬܦܗܐ ܠ

§1, 2, 8, 9, 75, 80, 95

ἀκίνητος (DeM)

ܠܝܬܬܦܗܐ

§78, 80, 82, 86, 96

κίνησις (CatJ, DeM)

ܠܝܬܬܦܗܐܐ

§8, 73, 76, 86, 89, 97

κίνησις (CatJ, AnPrG, DeM), τὸ
κινεῖσθαι (IsagAn, IsagAth, DeM)

zky

ܠܝܬܬܦܗܐ

§13, 36

≈ νίκος (a corruption for νεῖκος)

znʿ

ܠܝܬܬܦܗܐ

§24, 31, 44, 46, 47, 49,
82, 90

ποιός (IsagAn, CatAn), τρόπος (CatJ)

ܠܝܬܬܦܗܐ ܠܝܬܬܦܗܐ

§29, 31, 45, 49, 57, 68,
75, 81, 82

≈ ἄποιος

ܠܝܬܬܦܗܐ

§43, 50

τρόπος (CatAn, CatJ), ποιός (CatAn)

ܠܝܬܬܦܗܐܐ

§23–26, 42–45, 47, 48,
51, 53, 54, 57, 58, 70,
81–83

≈ ποιότης

ܠܝܬܬܦܗܐ

§31, 42, 49, 57, 58

ܠܝܬܬܦܗܐܐ

§23, 43, 63

zʿr

ܠܝܬܬܦܗܐ

§58

ὀλίγος (CatAn, CatJ), μικρός (CatAn,
CatJ, DeM)

zrʿ

ܠܝܬܬܦܗܐ

§46

σπέρμα (DeSim), γόνος (HippAph)

ܐ

hbl

ܐܬܬܦܗܐ

§33

≈ φθείρομαι

ܐܬܬܦܗܐܐ *Ethpa.*

§3, 4, 33, 34

φθείρομαι (DeM)

ܐܬܬܦܗܐܐ ܠܝܬܬܦܗܐ

§8, 10, 13, 34

φθορά (CatAn, Hof, SRInt, etc.)

ܐܬܬܦܗܐܐ ܠܝܬܬܦܗܐܐ

§33, 69, 77

≈ ἄφθαρτος

hbš

ܐܬܬܦܗܐܐ

§2, 22

περιέχω (IsagAn, IsagAth, DeM,
etc.), περιλαμβάνω (CatAn, CatJ),
διαλαμβάνω (DeM)

ܠܗܘܬܬܐ	§5, 23, 53, 54	θερμότης (CatAn, DeSim), θέρμα (DeM), θερμασία (DeSim)
hsn		
ܠܬܝܬܐ <i>adv.</i>	§41, 70	μόλις (HippAph)
hšb		
ܬܝܬܐ	§9, 68	ἀγέομαι (DeSim), ἀξιώ in ἀπαξιώ (DeM)
ܬܝܬܐ	§38, 41, 67, 70	≈ ἰδέα (Platonic); νόημα (DeInAn, DeInG)
ܠܬܝܬܐ ܬܝܬܐ	§26	≈ πρόνοια
hšh		
ܬܝܬܐ ܬܝܬܐ <i>Ethpa.</i>	§17	χρῶμαι (IsagAn, IsagAth, DeInAn, etc.)
hšš		
ܬܝܬܐ	§15, 37, 58–60, 69, 96	πάσχω (CatAn, CatJ, SRInt, etc.)
ܬܝܬܐ	§41	πάθημα (DeInAn, DeInG), πάθος (Hof)
ܬܝܬܐ	§38, 41, 44, 69, 74	παθητικός (Hof), παθητός (DeM)
ܠܬܝܬܐ ܬܝܬܐ	§43, 44	≈ πάθημα
htt		
ܬܝܬܐ	§73, 81	≈ ἀκριβής
ܬܝܬܐ ܬܝܬܐ	§86, 94	ἀκριβῶς (CatAn, CatJ), δι' ἀκριβείας (DeM)

ܬ

tb'		
ܬܝܬܐ	§24	έντυπό (DeM)
ܬܝܬܐ ܬܝܬܐ <i>Ethpa.</i>	§46, 84	
twps'		
ܬܝܬܐ ܬܝܬܐ	§63	< τύπος
ܬܝܬܐ ܬܝܬܐ	§63	≈ τὸ ἀντίτυπον, ἡ ἀντιτυπία
tkš'		
ܬܝܬܐ	§25, 26, 75, 85, 89, 90, 92, 93	< τάξις
ܬܝܬܐ <i>Pa.</i>	§26, 27, 97	τάσσω (DeM)
ܬܝܬܐ	§89	τάσσομαι (AnPrP, AnPrG), τεταγμένος (AnPrG), ἐν τάξει (DeM)
ܬܝܬܐ ܬܝܬܐ	§84, 89, 91, 92	ἄτακτος (DeM, AnPrG)

ܚܕܐܬܝܬܐ	§87	
ܚܕܐܬܝܬܐ ܠ	§75, 85, 90	ἀταξία (Pl.Tim.)
ܕܡܚܬܝܬܐ	§68	οὐκ ἀτάκτως (DeM)
ܕܡܚܬܝܬܐ ܠ	§25, 75, 76, 85, 87, 89, 90, 93	ἀτάκτως (Pl.Tim.)
ܬܝ		
ܬܝܬܐ	§10, 35	ἐξαπατάω (DeSim)
ܚܕܐܬܝܬܐ	§86	ἀπάτη (DeInG)
,		
ybš		
ܝܒܫܐ	§36	ξηρός (DeM)
ܚܕܐܬܝܬܐ	§23, 51, 54	ξηρότης (SRInt), τὸ ξηρόν (Hof)
ydy		
ܝܕܝܬܐ <i>Ethpe.</i>	§18, 19, 42	ὁμολογοῦμαι (Hof)
ܝܕܝܬܐܬܐ	§65	δοξαστός (Pl.Tim.; DeInAn), ὁμολογούμενος (CatJ, AnPrG)
ܚܕܝܬܐ	§6, 19, 65, 79, 87	δόξα (Pl.Tim.; DeInAn)
yd ^c		
ܝܕܐ	§17, 25, 88, 91	οἶδα (CatAn, CatJ, DeSim)
ܝܕܐܬܐ	§22, 30, 33, 42, 49, 50, 54, 55, 75, 76, 88	δῆλον (CatAn, CatJ, DeM, etc.), φανερὸν (CatJ)
ܝܕܐܬܐ <i>Ethpe.</i>	§19, 39	περιληπτός (Pl.Tim.), θεωροῦμαι (DeM), δηλοῦμαι (DeSim)
ܝܕܐܬܐ	§18, 30, 66, 76	διάνοια (Hof), γνώμη (Hof)
ܚܕܐܬܐܬܐ	§18	≈ γνώσις, νόησις
ܝܕܐܬܐܬܐ	§66	ἐπιστητός (CatJ)
ܚܕܐܬܐܬܐܬܐ	§19, 20	≈ τὰ νοητά
ܚܕܐܬܐܬܐܬܐܬܐ	§26	≈ πρόγνωσις
yhb		
ܝܠܐ	§85, 96, 97	δίδωμι (Hof), ἀποδίδωμι (CatAn, IsagAth)
yld		
ܝܠܐܬܐܬܐ	§88	≈ ψυχογονία
ylp		
ܝܠܐܬܐܬܐ <i>Ethpe.</i>	§70	ἀποτελοῦμαι (DeSim)
ܝܠܐܬܐ	§73	μάθησις (DeM), ἐπιστήμη (Hof)
ܝܠܐܬܐ	§95	≈ διδάσκαλος
ܚܕܐܬܐܬܐ	§17, 24, 25, 27, 28	διδασκαλία (IsagAn, IsagAth)

ym'		
ܡܝܡ	§6	θάλασσα (DeM)
y'y		
ܝܝܝ	§47	≈ φύομαι
yqr		
ܝܩܪ <i>Pa.</i>	§6	τιμάω (DeM)
ܝܩܪܐ	§12	βρίθος (DeM)
ysp		
ܝܨܦܐܬܝܬܐ <i>Ettaf.</i>	§67	προστίθεμαι (IsagAn, IsagAth, AnPrP)
ܝܨܦܐܬܐ	§25, 27	
yt'		
ܝܬܐ	§4, 33, 42–45, 49, 59, 63, 70	ἐαυτοῦ (CatAn, DeM)
ܝܬܐ ܕܐܬܐ	§73, 74, 82, 84	καθ' ἐαυτήν (DeM)
ytr		
ܝܬܪܐ	§21, 87	μᾶλλον (IsagAn, CatAn, DeM), μάλιστα (IsagAth, CatAn), comparative (CatAn, CatJ, CatG, etc.), superlative (IsagAth)
ܝܬܪܐ ܕܝܬܪܐ	§11, 77, 80, 91	μᾶλλον (IsagAn, IsagAth, CatJ, etc.), μάλιστα (DeM, IsagAn, IsagAth, etc.)

ܝܢ


k'p'		
ܟܦܪܐ	§96	λίθος (AnPrP, AnPrG), πέτρος (DeM)
kd		
ܟܕܐ ܕܐܕܐ	§5	αὐτός (AnPrG)
ܟܕܐ ܕܐܕܐ	§77, 80	αὐτός (CatAn, CatJ, DeInAn, etc.), οὕτως (IsagAth)
kwn		
ܟܘܢ	§46, 67, 70	πέφυκα (IsagAn, IsagAth, DeM, etc.)
<i>Af. part. pass.</i>		
ܟܘܢܐ	§3, 5, 20, 22, 28, 84, 88	φύσις (IsagAn, IsagAth, DeM, etc.)
ܟܘܢܐ	§1, 14, 97	φυσικός (CatAn, CatJ, DeM)
ܟܘܢܐܐ	§84	φύσει (IsagAn, DeInAn), κατὰ φύσιν (DeM)

kl		
ܠ	§5–8, 18, 21, 23, 24, 28, 29, 32–34, 36, 37, 41, 42, 47, 56, 57, 59, 61, 63, 69, 70, 73, 74, 76–79, 81, 85, 91	πᾶς (IsagAn, IsagAth, CatAn, etc.), ὅσος (CatAn, CatJ)
ܠܠ	§34, 44	ὅλως (CatAn, CatJ)
ܠܠܐ	§23, 81	τὸ ὅλον (IsagAn, CatAn)
ܠܠܐܠܐ	§83	καθόλου (DeInAn, DeInG)
ܠܠܠܐܠܐ → dwk		
ܠܠܠܐ → ḥd		
ܠܠܠܐܠܐ → mdm		
ܠܠܠܐܠܐ → prs		
km'		
ܠܠܠܐܠܐܠܐ	§48, 58, 63	ποσόν (CatAn, CatJ), ποσότης (SRInt)
ܠܠܠܐܠܐ	§58	ποσόν (CatG)
kny		
ܠܠܠܐܠܐ Pa.	§41, 81	≈ ὀνομάζω; κατηγορέω (CatAn)
ܠܠܠܐܠܐ	§41, 78, 92	ὄνομα (IsagAn, DeSim), κατηγορία (CatAn)
knš		
ܠܠܠܐܠܐܠܐ Ethpa.	§76	συνάδω (DeM)
ܠܠܠܐܠܐ	§17	συμπέρασμα (AnPrG)
ktb		
ܠܠܠܐܠܐ	§77	≈ γράφω
ktr		
ܠܠܠܐܠܐ Pa.	§3, 10, 33, 44, 51, 53, 70, 80, 82	μένω (DeM), ὑπομένω (CatJ), παραμένω (CatJ), διαμένω (CatJ, DeM), ἐπιμένω (DeM), στηρίζομαι (DeM)

lbk		
ܠܠܠܐܠܐܠܐܠܐ	§21, 22	≈ περιλαμβανόμενος

lwt ܠܘܬ	§10, 12, 19–21, 47, 50, 55, 58, 68, 79, 81, 85, 87, 96, 97	πρός <i>c. acc.</i> (IsagAn, IsagAth, CatAn, etc.)
ܠܘܬ ܕܠܐ lhḏ	§19	πρός τι (CatAn, CatJ, Hof)
ܠܘܬܐ lḥd	§36	μόνος (IsagAn, CatAn, CatJ, etc.)
ܠܘܬܐܐ lḥm	§36	≈ μονάς
ܠܘܬܐܐܐ Pa. ܠܘܬܐܐܐ	§26	ἀρμόζω (DeM), ἐφαρμόζω (CatJ)
ܠܘܬܐܐܐܐ ܠܘܬܐܐܐܐ	§26	συστοιχία (AnPrG)
ܠܘܬܐܐܐܐ ܠܘܬܐܐܐܐ	§79	
lpwt ܠܘܬܐܐܐܐ	§83	πρός <i>c. acc.</i> (CatAn, DeM), παρά <i>c. acc.</i> (DeM), κατά <i>c. acc.</i> (DeM)
ܡ		
m' ܡܐ	§22–24, 26–28, 30–32, 34, 39, 48, 49, 53, 54, 57, 60–66, 83, 89	ὥστε (IsagAn, IsagAth, CatAn, etc.), ἄρα (IsagAn, CatAn, AnPrP), οὖν (IsagAn, CatAn), δέ (IsagAn, DeInAn), γάρ (DeInAn), οὐκοῦν (CatAn, CatJ, AnPrP), οἷον (DeInAn)
mdm ܡܡܡ	§11, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 31–34, 39, 42, 43, 48–50, 52, 53, 55, 56, 58, 60, 62, 70, 71, 79, 80, 82, 83, 91, 96, 97	τίς (IsagAn, IsagAth, CatAn, etc.)
ܡܡܡܐ ܡܡܡܐܐ	§3, 5, 8, 42, 70, 79	τὰ πάντα (CatAn, DeM, CatJ, etc.), ὅσα (IsagAn), ἕκαστος (IsagAn)
ܡܡܡܐܐ ܡܡܡܐܐܐ	§17, 34, 42, 60, 96	οὐδεὶς (IsagAn, CatAn, CatJ, etc.)
mzg ܡܙܓ	§21	κράσις (DeSim)
mtl ܡܬܠ	§4, 17, 23, 25, 27–29, 33–35, 37, 38, 40, 43, 49, 52, 59, 69, 72, 76, 82, 90, 92, 95, 96	ὅτι (IsagAn, IsagAth, DeInAn, etc.), ἐπεὶ (IsagAn, IsagAth, CatAn, etc.), διό (CatAn, CatJ, CatG, etc.), περὶ <i>c. gen.</i> (IsagAn, IsagAth, CatJ, etc.), διὰ <i>c. acc.</i> (IsagAth, CatAn, CatJ, etc.)

my'		
ܡܝܬܐ	§5, 6, 13, 21–23, 35, 51–53	ὑδωρ (CatAn, DeM), ἔνυδρος (CatAn, CatG)
mkyl		
ܡܚܠܐ	§30, 52	λοιπόν (IsagAth)
ܡܚܠܐ ܠܐ	§37, 47, 82, 83	οὐκέτι (IsagAn, DeSim)
mll		
ܡܠܠܐ	§6	≈ λέγω
ܡܠܠܐ ܠܐ	§9, 16, 17, 19, 20, 26, 42, 45–47, 49, 52, 57, 63, 66, 68, 71, 73, 75, 86–88, 90, 94	λόγος (Pl. <i>Tim.</i> ; CatAn, IsagAn, etc.), ῥῆμα (DeInAn)
ܡܠܠܐ ܠܐ ܠܐ	§19, 65	ἄλογος (Pl. <i>Tim.</i> ; IsagAn, DeInAn)
mn		
ܡܢܐ	§28	τίς (IsagAn, IsagAth, CatAn, etc.)
mny		
ܡܢܝܐ	§5, 9, 36	ἄριθμός (IsagAn, IsagAth, CatAn)
ܡܢܝܐ ܠܐ	§10, 22, 23, 30	μέρος (DeM, IsagAth, CatAn, etc.), μόριον (CatG)
ܡܢܝܐ ܠܐ ܠܐ	§12	≈ ἀμερής
ܡܢܝܐ ܠܐ ܠܐ ܠܐ	§13	κατὰ μέρος (DeM)
mšy		
ܡܫܝܐ	§34, 49, 52, 54, 71, 72, 79, 82, 96, 97	δύναμαι (IsagAn), optative (IsagAn, DeM)
ܡܫܝܐ ܠܐ ܠܐ	§43	τὸ ἐνδεχόμενον (DeInAn, AnPrP, AnPrG)
mš'		
ܡܫܝܐ ܠܐ ܠܐ	§23, 96	μέσον (DeM, IsagAn, IsagAth, etc.), μεταξύ (IsagAn)
ܡܫܝܐ ܠܐ ܠܐ ܠܐ	§91, 92	μέσος (CatAn)
mr'		
ܡܪܝܐ	§13	δεσπότης (CatAn, CatJ, CatG)
ܡܪܝܐ ܠܐ ܠܐ	§20, 30, 37, 57, 67	κυρίως (IsagAth, CatAn, CatJ), ἁπλῶς (Hof), οἰκείως (CatAn)
mšḥ		
ܡܫܚܐ	§48	
ܡܫܚܐ ܠܐ ܠܐ	§70	μέτρον (DeM)
mtwm		
ܡܬܡܐ ܠܐ	§82, 97	ποτέ (IsagAn, IsagAth, CatJ, etc.), οὐδέποτε (CatAn, CatJ, CatG, etc.)
ܡܬܡܐ ܠܐ ܠܐ	§32, 48	αἰδῖος (DeInAn, DeInAth)

ܡܬܗ	§29	≈ αεί
ܡܬܗ	§58, 63	διάστημα (AnPrG), μέτρον (Hof)
ܡܬܗ ܡܬܬܗ	§58, 63	≈ τὰ τρία διαστήματα
		
nhr		
ܢܗܪܝܬܐ	§23	≈ τὸ σαφές
ܢܗܪܝܬܐ	§68	σαφής (IsagAn), ἀκριβής (DeSim)
nwr'		
ܢܝܪ	§7, 13, 22, 23, 35, 54	πῦρ (CatAn, CatJ, DeM, etc.)
ܢܝܪܐ	§22	πυρώδης (DeM)
nzl		
ܢܠ	§96	≈ πίπτω
nhš'		
ܢܚܫܐ	§46	χαλκός (IsagAn, IsagAth, DeM)
nṭr		
ܢܬܪܐ	§4, 33	φυλάσσω (DeM)
nyš'		
ܢܚܫܐ	§60, 86	≈ τέλος, σκοπός
nkr		
ܢܚܪܐ	§86	ἀλλότριος (CatAn, CatJ, CatG), έτεροῖος (DeM)
nsb		
ܢܨܒܐ	§30, 36, 41, 75, 83, 86, 92, 93	λαμβάνω (IsagAn, CatAn, CatJ, etc.), παραλαμβάνω (Pl. <i>Tim.</i>), προσλαμβάνω (AnPrP), περιαιρέω (CatAn)
ܢܨܒܐ ܬܗܝܬܐ <i>Ethpe.</i>	§97	λαμβάνομαι (IsagAn, IsagAth, AnPrP, etc.)
ܢܨܒܐ ܬܗܝܬܐ	§66	
npl		
ܢܦܠܐ	§60	ἐκπίπτω (DeSim)
nrq		
ܢܪܩܐ	§44	προσέρχομαι (IsagAn)
ܢܪܩܐ	§49, 70	ἔξοδος (DeM)
nrš		
ܢܪܫܐ	§73–76, 78, 82, 84, 86, 88	ψυχή (CatAn, CatJ, DeInAn, etc.)

nšb

ܢܫܒܬ *Ethpe.*

§92

ܢܫܒܬܐ

§92

φυτόν (CatAn, CatJ, DeM)

nqb

ܢܩܒܐ

§41, 55, 69, 81

τὸ θῆλυ (DeM, DeSim)

nqp

ܢܩܦܐ

§11, 25, 29, 37, 42, 47,
56, 82, 84, 86, 88, 95ἀκολουθέω (CatJ, DeInAn, DeInG,
etc.), πάρειμι (IsagAn, IsagAth),
συνάπτω (CatAn, CatJ, DeM), ἔπομαι
(IsagAth, DeInAn, DeInG)
συνάγω (DeM)
σύνειμι (IsagAn), ἀκολουθέω
(CatAn, DeM)ܢܩܦܐ *Af.*

§25

ܢܩܦܐܬܐ *Ethpa.*

§10

ܢܩܦܐܬܐ

§27

ܢܩܦܐܬܐ

§67

sbr

ܣܒܪܐ *Af.*

§3, 6, 86

οἶομαι (IsagAn, IsagAth, DeM),
δοκέω (CatAn, CatJ, DeM), φρονέω
(DeM), διαλαμβάνω (IsagAth),
ὑπολαμβάνω (IsagAn)
δοκέω (CatJ, CatG)ܣܒܪܐܬܐ *Ethpe.*

§6, 77

sgy

ܣܓܝܐ

§1, 2, 3, 71, 86

πολύς (IsagAn, CatAn, CatJ, etc.),
πλείων (IsagAn, AnPrP, CatAn, etc.),
πλεῖστος (CatAn, CatJ, IsagAth),
πάνυ (CatAn, CatJ), μέγας (CatAn),
πλήθος (CatAn, CatJ)
τὸ πολὺ (CatAn, CatJ, AnPrP,
AnPrAth), πολὺς (DeInAn), πλείων
(DeInAn), πλήθος (DeM, CatG)

ܣܓܝܐܬܐ

§36

swk

ܣܘܟܐ

§8, 48

≈ περαίνω

ܣܘܟܐܬܐ *Ethpe.*

§49

περαίνομαι (DeM)

ܣܘܟܐܬܐ

§1, 2, 9, 13, 48, 49

πεπερατωμένος (DeM), τὸ
πεπερατώσθαι (DeM)

ܣܘܟܐܬܐ

§1, 2, 9–12, 49, 71

ἄπειρος (DeInG)

ܦܥܐ	§29, 49, 57, 71, 82	πέρας (CatJ, DeM), ἄκρα (IsagAn, AnPrP), ἄκρον (AnPrP)
ܦܕܝܢܐܬܐ ܦܕ	§71	
ܕܦܥܥܐܬܐ ܦܕ	§71	
ܦܥܐ <i>adv.</i>	§86, 94	ὅλως (DeInAn, DeSim, CatJ), οὐδαμῶς (CatJ, CatG, DeInG)
swlwgysmw		
ܦܥܥܥܐ ܦܥܥܥܐ	§17	< συλλογισμός
sybr		
ܦܕܝܢܐ	§5	τροφή (DeSim)
sym		
ܦܥܥܐ	§1, 2, 7–10, 35, 49, 73–75, 84, 95	προτίθημι (IsagAn), ὑπόκειμαι (AnPrP, AnPrG)
ܦܥܥܐ ܦܥܥܐ	§24, 31, 41, 43, 50	τὸ ὑποκείμενον (IsagAn, IsagAth, CatAn, etc.)
ܦܥܥܐܕܐܐ <i>Ethpe.</i>	§72, 78	τίθεμαι (AnPrG), κεῖμαι (IsagAn, IsagAth), σύγκειμαι (DeInAn, DeInAth), ὑποτάσσομαι (IsagAn), τὸ ὑποκείμενον (CatAn), θέσις (CatAn), διάθεσις (CatAn)
ܦܥܥܐ	§78, 82	θέσις (CatAn, CatJ, AnPrP, etc.), διάθεσις (CatAn), ὑπόθεσις (AnPrP, AnPrG)
skl		
ܦܥܥܐܐ <i>Ethpe.</i>	§75	νοέω (DeInAn, DeInG)
slq		
ܦܥܥܐ	§20	ἀνάγω (AnPrP, AnPrG), ἀναφέρω (DeM)
snv		
ܦܥܥܐ	§91	χείρων (CatG)
snq		
ܦܥܥܐ	§52	δέομαι (IsagAn), τὸ προσδεόμενον (AnPrP), χρεῖος (IsagAn, AnPrP)
ܦܥܥܐܐ	§47	δέομαι (DeM)
spq		
ܦܥܥܐܐܐܐ	§12	τὸ κενόν (SRInt, Hof)
sqbl		
ܦܥܥܐܐ	§90–92	τὸ ἀντικείμενον (IsagAn, IsagAth)
srṭ		
ܦܥܥܐܐ	§48	γραμμή (CatAn, CatJ, CatG, etc.)



‘bd		
ܒܕ	§1, 10, 15, 38, 39, 60, 79, 80, 87, 88, 89, 93	ποιέω (IsagAn, IsagAth, DeM, etc.)
ܒܕܐܢܐܢ <i>Af.</i>	§80	ἐνεργέω (DeM, DeInAn, DeInG)
ܒܕܐܢܐܢ <i>Ethpe.</i>	§39, 80	ποιούμαι (CatAn)
ܒܕܐܢܐܢ	§10, 27, 28, 32, 37–39, 47, 73, 74, 79, 80	ποιητικός (CatAn, CatJ)
ܒܕܐܢܐܢ	§47, 79	ἔργον (DeV)
ܒܕܐܢܐܢܐܢ	§95, 97	
ܒܕܐܢܐܢܐܢܐܢ	§18, 26–28, 64	ἐνέργεια (DeM, IsagAn, IsagAth, etc.)
‘br		
ܒܪ	§49, 57, 71	συμπέρασμα (AnPrG)
‘zl		
ܒܪܐܢܐܢ <i>QuadRef.</i>	§12	πεπλεγμένος (DeInG)
‘tp		
ܒܬܐ	§10	ἀντιστρέφω (CatAn, DeInG)
‘yn		
ܒܢܐܢ	§76	≈ πηγή
‘ly		
ܒܠܐܢ	§25	ἀνώτερος (DeM), ἐπαναβεβηκός (IsagAn, IsagAth)
‘ll		
ܒܠܐ	§84	≈ εἰσέρχομαι
ܒܠܐܢ <i>Af.</i>	§10, 95	≈ εἰσάγω
ܒܠܐܢ	§10, 28, 32, 68, 72, 74, 80, 96	αἰτία (AnPrP, AnPrG, DeV), αἴτιον (CatAn, CatJ, DeM, etc.)
‘lm’		
ܒܠܐܢܐܢ	§12, 86–90, 93, 94	κόσμος (CatAn, CatJ, DeM), αἰών (DeM)
ܒܠܐܢܐܢ	§84	εἰς αἰῶνα (DeM)
‘sq		
ܒܠܐܢܐܢ	§85	χαλεπός (CatAn, CatJ, CatG), δυσ- (CatAn, CatJ)
‘pp		
ܒܠܐܢܐܢܐܢ	§59	≈ διπλῶ
‘qb		
ܒܠܐܢܐܢ <i>Pa.</i>	§3, 5, 24, 35, 56	σκέπτομαι (SextEmp)
ܒܠܐܢܐܢ	§1, 87	ἐξέτασις (IsagAn)

‘qr	ܩܪܐ	§13	ρίζα (DeSim)
‘rtl	ܩܪܬܐ	§41, 67, 70	≈ γυμνός
‘td	ܩܕܡܐ	§47, 79, 92	μέλλον (CatAn, CatJ, DeM, etc.)

ܩ

p’’	ܩܩܐ	§25, 26	κρείσσων (DeM), πρέπω (DeM)
p’wt’	ܩܘܬܐ	§6	< ποιητής
pgr	ܩܪܝܐ	§21	σῶμα (DeSim, CatJ)
pwš	ܩܘܫܐ	§43	≈ μένω
pḥm	ܩܚܡܐ	§23, 26	≈ ἀναλογία, σύγκρισις
pylswp’	ܩܝܠܫܘܦܐ	§3, 18, 88	< φιλόσοφος
	ܩܝܠܫܘܫܐ	§5	< φιλοσοφία
pys	ܩܝܫܐ	§83	< πείσις
plg	ܩܠܐ Pa.	§23, 36, 74	διαιρέω (Pol), ἀντιδιαιρέω (CatAn)
	ܩܠܐܐ Ethpa.	§63, 73, 74, 76	διαιροῦμαι (IsagAn, IsagAth, CatAn, etc.), διαλύομαι (AnPrP, AnPrG)
	ܩܠܐܐ	§2, 74	διαίρεσις (IsagAn, IsagAth, CatAn, etc.), διαιρετικός (IsagAn), διάστασις (CatG), διανέμησις (DeM)
	ܩܠܐ ܩܠܐ	§74	≈ ἀδιάφορος
plṭ	ܩܠܬܐ	§2	συγγέω (DeSim)
psq	ܩܣܩܐ Ethpa.	§71	τέμνομαι (CatAn, IsagAth)
	ܩܣܩܐܐ ܩܠܐ	§12	ἄτομος (CatAn, CatJ, IsagAth, etc.)
	ܩܣܩܐܐܐ	§73	κεφαλαιωδῶς (DeM), σύντομον (IsagAth)

prs (< πόρος)		
ܥܐܝܠܐ ܥܐܝܠܐ	§37, 80, 92	πάντως (IsagAn, IsagAth, CatJ, etc.)
ܥܐܝܠܐ ܥܐܝܠܐ	§48	≈ πάντως
prš		
ܥܐܝܠܐ Pa.	§10, 23, 86	ὀρίζω (IsagAn, IsagAth), διορίζω (CatAn, CatJ), προσδιορίζω (DeInAn), διαφέρω (IsagAn, CatAn), διαλαμβάνω (CatAn)
ܥܐܝܠܐ Ethpa.	§10	ὀρίζομαι (CatAn, DeInAn, DeInG), ἀφορίζομαι (IsagAth), κατηγοροῦμαι (IsagAn)
ܥܐܝܠܐ	§13	διαφορά (IsagAn, CatAn), ἀφορισμός (CatG)
ܥܐܝܠܐ	§11, 14, 15, 18, 23	ἀφορίζω (CatAn), διορίζω (CatAn), διαφέρω (IsagAn, CatAn)
ܥܐܝܠܐ	§76	χωριστός (IsagAn)
pšt		
ܥܐܝܠܐ	§29, 30, 33, 62, 68	ἀπλός (CatJ, DeSim)
ܥܐܝܠܐ	§4, 56, 67	ἀπλῶς (IsagAn, CatAn, CatJ, etc.)
pšq		
ܥܐܝܠܐ Pa.	§85, 87, 94, 95	≈ ἐρμηνεύω

س

šbw		
ܥܐܝܠܐ	§1, 27, 28, 33, 41, 76	πράγμα (IsagAn, DeSim)
šbt		
ܥܐܝܠܐ Pa.	§26, 27, 89	διακοσμέω (DeM)
ܥܐܝܠܐ Ethpa.	§27	
ܥܐܝܠܐ	§94	κόσμος (DeM)
šdd		
ܥܐܝܠܐ Af.	§79	≈ θεωρέω
ܥܐܝܠܐ	§80	≈ θεωρήσεις
šly		
ܥܐܝܠܐ Ethpe.	§12	≈ κλίνω, κλίνομαι

ܡ

qbl

ܡܠܐ <i>Pa.</i>	§24, 41, 43, 44, 46, 49, 55, 59, 64, 70, 71, 76, 81–83	δέχομαι (CatAn, CatJ, CatG), ἐπιδέχομαι (IsagAn, IsagAth, CatAn, etc.), παραδέχομαι (CatAn, CatG), ἐνδέχομαι (DeInG), ὑποδέχομαι (DeM), δεκτικός (IsagAn, CatAn)
ܡܡܠܬܐ ܗܬܐ	§41	πανδεχής (Pl. <i>Tim.</i>)
ܡܡܠܬܐ	§34, 41, 55, 58, 69, 70, 73, 81, 83	δεκτικός (IsagAn, IsagAth, CatJ, etc.), ὑποδοχή (Pl. <i>Tim.</i>)
ܡܠܡܠܬܐ	§72, 92	ἐναντίος (IsagAn, CatAn, DeM), ἀντίκειμαι (IsagAn, CatAn, CatG, etc.)
ܡܠܡܠܬܐ	§36–38, 58, 72	ἐναντίος (CatAn), ἀντίκειμαι (CatAn, DeInAn, DeInG, etc.)
ܡܠܡܠܬܐ ܡܠܡܠܬܐ	§11	τὸ ἐναντίον (CatAn), ἐναντιότης (CatAn), ἀντίθεσις (CatAn, CatJ)
ܡܠܡܠܬܐ ܡܠܡܠܬܐ	§63	≈ τὸ ἀντίτυπον, ἡ ἀντιτυπία
ܡܡܠܬܐ	§55	κεῖμαι (DeM)
ܡܠܡܠܬܐ	§23	
qdm		
ܡܡܠܬܐ	§7, 60, 79	≈ πρό-
ܡܡܠܬܐ ܡܡܠܬܐ	§79	≈ προοράω
ܡܡܠܬܐ ܡܡܠܬܐ	§79	≈ προνοέω
ܡܡܠܬܐ ܡܡܠܬܐ <i>Ethpe.</i>	§30, 32	≈ πρό-
ܡܡܠܬܐ	§32	πρότερος (IsagAn, CatAn, CatJ, etc.)
ܡܡܠܬܐ ܡܡܠܬܐ	§26	≈ πρόνοια
ܡܡܠܬܐ ܡܡܠܬܐ	§26	≈ πρόγνωσις
ܡܡܠܬܐ ܡܡܠܬܐ	§30	≈ πρόθεσις
ܡܡܠܬܐ	§1, 3, 5–7, 17, 20, 21, 27–29, 35–39, 41, 47, 50, 55, 58, 60, 68, 70, 72, 73, 75–80, 83–87	πρότερος (IsagAn, IsagAth, CatAn, etc.)
(ܡܡܠܬܐ ܡܡܠܬܐ)	§3	οἱ πρεσβύτεροι (IsagAn), οἱ παλαιοί (IsagAn)
ܡܡܠܬܐ		
ܡܡܠܬܐ <i>prep.</i>	§17, 29, 30, 32, 36, 41, 77, 87–89	πρίν (Pl. <i>Tim.</i>); πρό <i>c. gen.</i> (IsagAn, IsagAth, CatAn, etc.), πρότερος (IsagAn, IsagAth), πρῶτος (DeM)

ܡܢ ܥܕ ܕܡܢܐ	§76, 89 §3, 5, 28, 29, 39–41	πρότερον (DeM) πρότερον (IsagAn, CatAn, CatJ, etc.), πρῶτον (DeInAn, AnPrP, AnPrG, etc.), προηγουμένως (IsagAn, IsagAth)
qwm ܩܡܐ	§4, 24, 52, 54, 84, 94	πάρεμι (DeInAn), κεῖμαι (CatAn), κατέζομαι (IsagAn)
ܩܡܐܐ <i>Af.</i>	§27	συνίστημι (IsagAn), ὑφίστημι (IsagAth)
ܩܡܐܐ <i>Ethpa.</i>	§47	συνίσταμαι (IsagAn, DeM), ὑφίσταμαι (IsagAn, IsagAth)
ܩܡܐܐ	§23, 94	στάσις (CatAn, CatJ, CatG)
ܩܡܐܐ	§24	
ܩܡܐܐ	§47, 80, 86, 90, 94	ὑπόστασις (IsagAth), σύστασις (IsagAn, IsagAth, CatJ, etc.), διάθεσις (CatAn, CatJ, CatG), τὸ ὑφιστάμενον (IsagAn), σύστημα (DeM)
qṭ'gryws ܩܬܓܪܝܘܫ	§58	< κατηγορία
qtrg ܩܬܪܓ	§60	< κατηγοροῦμαι
<i>QuadRef.</i>		
qll ܩܠܠܐܠܐ	§23	ταχύς (DeM)
qny ܩܢܝ	§11, 19, 45, 46, 47, 51, 53, 54, 71, 81, 82, 86, 92, 96	ἔχω (IsagAn, DeM)
qrb ܩܪܒܐ	§21	προσεχής (IsagAn, IsagAth), ἐγγίω (CatAn), πάρεμι (DeInG)
qry 1 ܩܪܝ	§6, 13, 19, 24, 27, 40–42, 50, 77, 78	καλέω (IsagAn, IsagAth, AnPrP)
ܩܪܝܐ <i>Ethpe.</i>	§19, 20, 24, 57, 67, 88	λέγεται (IsagAn, IsagAth, DeM)
qry 2 ܩܪܝܐ	§44, 46	< κηρός

qrr		
ܩܪܝܐ	§36	ψυχρός (CatAn, CatJ, CatG), παγετώδης (DeM)
ܩܪܝܝܐܝܐ	§23, 51–53	ψυχρότης (CatAn, CatJ, CatG, DeM)
qšy		
ܩܫܐ	§21, 22	σκληρός (CatAn, CatJ, CatG)

i

rby		
ܪܒܝ	§58	μέγας (IsagAn, AnPrP, AnPrG), αυξόμενος (CatAn, CatJ)
ܪܒܝܐܝܐ	§12	μέγεθος (CatAn, CatJ, CatG, DeM)
ܪܒܝܐܝܐܝܐ	§55	τιθήνη (Pl. <i>Tim</i>)
rdy		
ܪܕܝ	§20	πορεύομαι (DeM), ῥέω (DeM)
rgš		
ܪܓܝܝܐ	§18–20, 65	αἴσθησις (DeM)
ܪܓܝܝܐܝܐ	§61	αἰσθητός (IsagAth, CatAn, CatJ, etc.)
ܪܓܝܝܐܝܐܝܐ	§19–21	τὰ αἰσθητά (IsagAth, CatAn, CatJ, etc.)
ܪܓܝܝܐܝܐܝܐ	§19	αἴσθησις (Pl. <i>Tim</i> .)
ܪܓܝܝܐܝܐܝܐܝܐ	§18	≈ αἴσθησις
ܪܓܝܝܐܝܐܝܐܝܐܝܐ	§67, 70	τὸ αἰσθητικόν (IsagAth)
rwh		
ܪܘܝܐ	§22	πνεῦμα (DeM, HippAph), ἄνεμος (DeM)
rwm		
ܪܘܡܐܝܐ <i>Af.</i>	§25, 58	ἀναιρέω (IsagAth), ἀφαιρέω (DeSim), ἀπόφημι (DeInG)
ܪܘܡܐܝܐܝܐ <i>Ettaf.</i>	§34, 81	ἀναιροῦμαι (IsagAn, IsagAth, CatJ, etc.), συναιροῦμαι (IsagAth, CatG), περιαιροῦμαι (CatAn, CatJ, CatG)
ܪܘܡܐܝܐܝܐ	§25	ἀποφατικός (CatJ)
ܪܘܡܐܝܐܝܐܝܐܝܐ	§91	ἀπόφασις (CatJ)
rhm		
ܪܘܡܐܝܐܝܐܝܐ	§13, 36	≈ φιλία
rtb		
ܪܬܒܐܝܐ	§22, 36	ὕγρός (DeM)
ܪܬܒܐܝܐܝܐܝܐ	§5, 6, 51, 53, 54	τὸ ὑγρόν (DeM), ὑγρότης (SRInt)

ryš'

ܪܝܫ

§1–4, 9–17, 20, 28–40,
48, 73–76, 86, 90, 91ἀρχή (IsagAn, IsagAth, DeM, etc.),
ἄκρον (IsagAth, AnPrG), κεφαλή
(CatJ, CatG)

ܪܝܫܐ

§4–7, 24, 27, 28, 34,
39, 60, 68, 69, 72, 76,
78

ἀρχή (AnPrP)

rkb

ܪܝܬܐ Pa.

§25, 57, 88

συντίθημι (SRInt)

ܪܝܬܐ Ethpa.

§30, 58, 68, 89

συντίθεμαι (IsagAn, IsagAth,
DeInAn, etc.), περιτίθεμαι (CatAn),
ἀντίκειμαι (DeInAn)

ܪܝܬܐܐ

§17, 30, 33

σύνθεσις (Hof, Pol)

ܪܝܬܐܐ

§30, 31, 33, 62

σύνθετος (DeSim), πεπλεγμένος
(DeInG), προαιρούμενος (DeInAn,
DeInAth)

ܪܝܬܐܐܐ

§25, 27, 28

≈ σύνθετος

rny

ܪܝܢܐ

§88, 89

φρονέω (DeM)

ܪܝܢܐ Ethpe.

§17, 30, 32, 41, 48

ἐπινοοῦμαι (IsagAn, IsagAth)

r'y

ܪܝܢܐ Ethpa.

§79

δοξάζω (CatAn), φρονέω (DeM)

ܪܝܢܐ ܡܢ

§79

≈ προνοέω

ܪܝܢܐ

§13, 16, 19, 23, 25, 27,
30, 42, 45, 49, 68, 71,
73, 77, 85, 86, 88, 93–
95νόησις (Pl.Tim.), δόξα (CatAn),
ἐπίνοια (IsagAn)

ܪܝܢܐܐ

§66, 79, 81, 97

διάνοια (DeInAn, DeInAth, DeM)

ršm

ܪܝܡܐ

§27, 28, 38, 39

≈ ιδέα



šbl

ܫܒܠܐ

§46

šbq

ܫܒܩܐ

§74

ἀφίημι (HippAph)

ܫܒܩܐ Ethpe.

§82

καταλείπομαι (CatAn, CatJ, CatG),
ἀφίημι (DeInAn, DeInG)

šgny

𐤌𐤒 Quad.

§3

ἀλλοιόω (CatG)

𐤌𐤒 ܕܗܝܪ

§3, 4, 42, 43, 51–54,

ἀλλοιούμαι (CatAn, CatJ)

QuadRef.

59, 83

𐤌𐤒 ܐܝ

§4, 8, 11, 55, 68

ἀλλοίωσις (CatAn, CatJ)

𐤌𐤒 ܕܗܝܪ

§42, 69, 70

𐤌ܕܝܠܝܢ ܕܗܝܪ

§50, 83

šgš

𐤌ܕܝܠܝܢ

§90, 92

šdy

𐤌𐤃

§96

ἀποβάλλω (IsagAth), ῥίπτω (DeM)

šwd^c

ܫܝܠܝܢ Quad.

§48, 91, 93

σημαίνω (CatAn, CatJ, DeInAn, etc.),
προσημαίνω (DeInAn, DeInAth),
δηλόω (DeSim)

𐤌ܕܝܠܝܢ

§47

≈ τὸ σημαινόμενον

šwy

𐤌𐤃

§36

ἴσος (CatAn, CatJ, CatG, etc.)

šwzb

ܫܝܠܝܢ Quad.

§96

šwtp^r

ܫܝܠܝܢ Quad.

§58, 90

κοινωνέω (SRInt)

ܫܝܠܝܢ ܕܗܝܪ

§85

κοινωνέω (CatAn, CatG), μετέχω
(IsagAn, IsagAth), μέτεμι (DeM)

QuadRef.

𐤌ܕܝܠܝܢ ܕܗܝܪ

§81

κοινωνία (IsagAn, IsagAth, DeM),
μέθεξις (IsagAn, IsagAth), μετουσία
(IsagAn, IsagAth), ἄθροισις (IsagAn)

šhlp

ܫܝܠܝܢ Quad.

§44

διαφέρω (IsaAn, IsagAth, CatJ, etc.)

ܫܝܠܝܢ ܕܗܝܪ

§43, 44, 51, 53, 54, 59,

μεταβάλλω (CatAn, CatJ)

QuadRef.

83

ܫܝܠܝܢ

§4, 43, 44, 53

μεταβολή (CatAn, IsagAn), διαφορά
(CatJ, IsagAn, IsagAth), ἀλλοίωσις
(Pol, SRInt)

ܫܝܠܝܢ ܕܗܝܪ

§42, 69

ܫܝܠܝܢ ܕܗܝܪ

§50

ܫܝܠܝܢ ܕܗܝܪ

§81

μετα- (DeInAn), ἄλλως (DeSim)

šth

ܫܝܠܝܢ

§48

ἐπιφάνεια (CatAn, CatJ)

škh			
ܫܚܐ <i>Af.</i>	§24		εὐρίσκω (DeM, DeSim), ἐξευρίσκω (DeSim), ζητέω (DeM), ἐνδέχομαι (DeInAn), δυνατός (CatJ, CatG, DeInAn, etc.)
ܫܚܐܝܢ <i>Ethpe.</i>	§27, 28, 55		εἰμί (DeM), εὐρίσκομαι (DeSim)
ܫܚܐܝܢܐ	§5		δυνατός (DeInAn, AnPrP)
škr			
ܫܚܐܝܢܐ	§47		ἄτοπος (DeInAn, DeInAth)
šlt			
ܫܠܬܐ	§74		ἄρχω (DeM)
šly			
ܫܠܝܐ	§85		παύομαι (IsagAn, IsagAth), ἡρεμέω (Hof)
šlm			
ܫܠܡܐ	§12, 36, 79		ὁμολογέω (DeM)
ܫܠܡܐܝܢܐ	§67		τέλος (Hof), ἀποτέλεσμα (DeM), τελευτή (DeM)
ܫܠܡܐܝܢܐܝܢܐ	§79		συνθήκη (DeInAn, DeInAth), τὸ σύμφωνον (DeM), ὁμολογία (DeM)
šm'			
ܫܡܐ	§78		ὄνομα (IsagAn, CatAn, CatJ, etc.)
šmh'			
ܫܡܐܝܢܐ	§73, 76, 78		καλέω (DeM), ὀνομάζω (DeM)
šmy'			
ܫܡܐܝܢܐ	§77		οὐρανός (Pl. <i>Tim.</i> , DeM)
šmly			
ܫܡܠܝܐ <i>Quad.</i>	§10, 12, 89		συμπληρώω (IsagAth), ἀποτελέω (IsagAth, DeM), ἐπιτελέω (DeM)
ܫܡܠܝܐܝܢܐ	§47		συμπληρωτικός (IsagAn)
šm'			
ܫܡܐ	§90		ἀκούω (DeM, DeInAn, DeInG)
š'y			
ܫܚܐܝܢܐ <i>Ethpa.</i>	§87, 90		προφητεύω (DeM)
špr			
ܫܦܪܐ	§37, 40		≈ καλός
ܫܦܪܐܝܢܐ	§25, 26		κάλλος (DeM)
ܫܦܪܐܝܢܐܝܢܐ	§68, 91		καλός (CatAn, CatJ, CatG, etc.)
ܫܦܪܐܝܢܐܝܢܐܝܢܐ	§79		καλῶς (DeInAn, DeV), μετρίως (CatAn)

šry

,ie Pa.

§16, 20, 79, 87

ἄρχομαι (IsagAn, IsagAth), λύω
(CatAn, CatJ, CatG), ἰδρύω (DeM)

ܠܝܐ

§17, 20, 24, 25, 28

≈ πρῶτος

ܠܝܐ

§85

ܠܝܐܢ

§6

ܠܝܐܢܐ

§85

ܠܝܐܢܐ

§87

ἀρχή (IsagAn, CatAn, CatJ, etc.)

šryn'

ܠܝܐ

§22

≈ ἀρτηρία

šrk

ܚܝܐ

§33, 48, 89

καταλείπω (CatAn)

šrr

ܠܝܐܝܐ

§18, 89

ἀληθής (IsagAn, IsagAth, CatAn,
etc.)

ܕܠܝܐܝܐ

§20, 30, 32

ἀληθῶς (CatAn, CatG), ἀληθές
(DeInG)

ܠܝܐܝܐܢܐ

§23

ܕܝ

tḥwm'

ܕܝܠܡܐ

§27

ὅρος (IsagAth, CatAn, DeM, etc.),
ὀρισμός (IsagAn, IsagAth, CatJ),
ὑπογραφή (IsagAn), πέρας (DeM),
λόγος (IsagAn, DeInAn)

ܕܝܠܡܐ Pa.

§42

ὀρίζω (CatAn, CatJ, CatG), ἀφορίζω
(IsagAn, IsagAth), διορίζω (AnPrP),
ἀποδίδωμι (IsagAn, CatAn, CatJ,
etc.)

ܕܝܠܡܐܝܐ Ethpa.

§15, 40, 48, 77

ὀρίζομαι (CatAn, CatJ, CatG),
ἀφορίζομαι (IsagAn, IsagAth),
διορίζομαι (DeM, DeInAn, DeInG,
etc.)

tlt

ܕܝܠܡܐ

§1, 28, 39, 58, 63, 74–
77

τρεῖς (Pl.Tim.)

ܕܝܠܡܐܝܐ

§77

τριχῇ (Pl.Tim.), τριχῶς (AnPrG)

tnn

ܕܝܠܡܐ

§23

ὁμοῦ (DeM)

tqn

ܩܬܢ <i>Pa.</i>	§73, 88, 97	≈ κοσμέω
ܩܬܢܐ <i>Ethpa.</i>	§27, 28, 79, 80	κεκοσμήσθαι (DeM), διατάσσομαι (DeM)
ܩܬܢܐ ܩܬܢܐ	§85	≈ ἀκόσμητος
ܩܬܢܐ	§94	κόσμος (DeM), διακόσμησις (DeM), κατασκευή (DeM)

tryn

ܩܬܢܐ	§1, 17, 23, 35, 37, 46, 47, 51, 53, 54, 72, 74, 76, 83	δύο (IsagAn, IsagAth, DeInAn, etc.), ἀμφοτέρως (AnPrG)
ܩܬܢܐ	§20	δευτερος (CatAn, CatJ)
ܩܬܢܐܐ	§36	≈ δυνάς
ܩܬܢܐܐ	§37	

trṣ

ܩܬܢܐܐ	§67, 76	εὐθύς (CatJ, DeM)
-------	---------	-------------------

Greek Glossary

ἀγένητος : hwy
 ἀγέομαι : hšb
 ἄγω : 'ty,
 ἀδιάφορος : plg
 αἶ : 'mn, mtwm
 ἀήρ : ''r
 ἄθροισις : šwtp'
 αἶδιος : mtwm
 αἵρεσις : hrysyz
 αἴσθησις : rgš
 αἰσθητικός : rgš
 αἰσθητός : rgš
 αἰτία : 'll
 αἴτιον : 'll
 αἰών : 'lm'
 ἀκίνητος : zw'
 ἀκολουθέω : nqr
 ἀκόσμητος : tqn
 ἀκούω : šm'
 ἄκρα : swk
 ἀκρίβεια : htt
 ἀκριβής : htt, nhr
 ἄκρον : swk, ryš'
 ἀληθής : šrr
 ἀλλήλων : hd
 ἀλλοιόω : 'hr, šgny
 ἀλλοιώσις : šgny, šhlp
 ἄλλος : 'hr
 ἀλλότριος : nkr
 ἄλλως : 'hr, šhlp
 ἄλογος : mll
 ἄμα : 'khd
 ἀμερής : mnny
 ἀμφότερος : tryn
 ἀναγκαῖος : 'ls
 ἀνάγκη : 'ls, 'nnq'
 ἀνάγω : slq
 ἀναιρέω : btl, rwm
 ἀναλογία : phm
 ἀναφαίνω : hwy

ἀναφέρω : slq
 ἀνείδεος : 'dš'
 ἄνεμος : rwh
 ἄνευ : bl'd
 ἄνθρωπος : 'nš'
 ἄνισος : 'pzg'
 ἀντιδιαίρῃω : plg
 ἀντίθεσις : qbl
 ἀντίκειμαι : sqbl, rkb
 ἀντιστρέφω : 'tp
 ἀντίτυπον : twps', qbl
 ἀνώτερος : 'ly
 ἀξιόω : hšb
 ἀξίωμα : 'ksywm'
 ἄορατος : hzy
 ἀπάτη : t'y
 ἄπειρος : swk
 ἀπλός : pšt
 ἀπλῶς : gw', mr'
 ἀποβάλλω : šdy
 ἀποδείκνυμι : hwy
 ἀποδεικτικός : hwy
 ἀποδίδωμι : yhb, thwm'
 ἄποιοις : zn'
 ἀπορία : b'y
 ἀποτέλεσμα : šlm
 ἀποτελέω : ylp, šmly
 ἀπόφασις : rwm
 ἀποφατικός : rwm
 ἀπόφημι : rwm
 ἀπώλεια : 'bd
 ἄρα : 'r', m'
 ἀραιόω : dll
 ἀριθμός : mnny
 ἀρμόζω : lhm
 ἀρτηρία : šryn'
 ἀρχή : ryš', šry
 ἄρχω : šlt, šry
 ἀσώματος : gšm
 ἄτακτος : tks'

ἄταξία : tks'	διαμένω : ktr
ἄτομος : psq	διανέμησις : plg
ἄτοπος : škr	διάνοια : yd', r'y
αὐξάνω : rby	διάστασις : plg
αὐτός : dyl, kd	διάστημα : mth
ἀφαιρέω : rwm	διατάσσω : tqn
ἄφθαρτος : hbl	διαφέρω : prš, šhlp
ἀφίημι : šbq	διαφορά : prš, šhlp
ἀφορίζω : prš, thwm'	διδασκαλία : ylp
ἀφορισμός : prš	διδάσκαλος : ylp
βλέπω : hzy	δίδωμι : yhb
βριθος : yqr	διό : gwn, mtl
γάρ : m'	διορίζω : prš, thwm'
γένεσις : hwy	διπλῶ : 'pp
γένος : gns'	δοκέω : sbr
γῆ : 'r'	δόξα : ydy, r'y
γίγνομαι : hwy	δοξάζω : r'y
γνώμη : yd'	δοξαστός : ydy
γνώσις : yd'	δυάς : tryn
γόνος : zr'	δύναμαι : mšy
γραμματή : srl	δύναμις : hyl'
γράφω : ktb	δυνατός : škh
γυμνός : 'rtl	δύο : tryn
δέ : m'	δυσ- : 'sq
δείκνυμι : hwy	ἐαυτοῦ : yt'
δεκτικός : qbl	ἐγγίων : qrb
δεσμός : 'sr	εἰ : 'n
δεσπότης : mr'	εἶδος : 'dš', hwr
δεύτερος : tryn	εἰκότως : zdq
δέχομαι : qbl	εἰμί : 'yt, 'ty, hwy, škh
δέω : zdq, snq	ἔοικα : hzy
δῆλος : yd'	εἶς : hd
δηλόω : yd'	εἰσάγω : 'll
διά : 'yd', mtl	εἰσέρχομαι : 'll
διάθεσις : sym, qwm	εἶτα : btr
διαίρεσις : plg	ἕκαστος : hd, mdm
διαίρετικός : plg	ἐκάτερος : hd
διαίρέω : plg	ἐκμαγεῖον : 'qm'gwn
διακοσμέω : šbt	ἐκπίπτω : npl
διακόσμησις : tqn	ἐκτός : br'
διαλαμβάνω : hbš, sbr, prš	ἐναντίος : qbl
διαλύω : plg	ἐναντιότης : qbl

ἐνδέχομαι : mšy, qbl, škh

ἐνέργεια : 'bd

ἐνεργέω : 'bd

ἐντυπώ : t̥b'

ἔνυδρος : my'

ἔνυλος : hwl'

ἐξαπατάω : t'y

ἐξέτασις : 'qb

ἐξευρίσκω : škh

ἐξῆς : btr

ἔξις : 'yt

ἔξοδος : nprq

ἔοικα : dmy

ἐπαναβαίνω : 'ly

ἐπεί : mtl

ἔπειτα : btr

ἐπιδέχομαι : qbl

ἐπιλαμβάνω : 'hd

ἐπιμένω : ktr

ἐπινοέω : rny

ἐπίνοια : r'y

ἐπιστήμη : ylp

ἐπιστητός : yd'

ἐπιτελέω : šmly

ἐπιφάνεια : šth

ἔπομαι : nqr

ἔργον : 'bd

ἐρμηνεύω : pšq

ἐτεροῖος : nkr

ἐτέρως : 'hr

ἔτι : hkyl

εὐθύς : trš

εὐρίσκω : škh

ἐφαρμόζω : lhm

ἔχω : 'yt, qny

ζητέω : b'y, škh

ἦδη : h'

ἦκω : 'ty

ἡρεμέω : šly

ἦττον : bšr

θάλασσα : ym'

θεός : 'lh

θέρμα : hmm

θερμαίνω : hmm

θερμασία : hmm

θερμός : hmm

θερμότης : hmm

θέσις : sym

θεωρέω : hzy, yd', šdd

θεώρησις : šdd

θῆλυ : nqb

ἰδέα : 'dš', hšb, ršm

ἰδικός : dyl

ἴδιος : dyl, hq

ἰδιότης : dyl

ἰδίως : hd

ἰδρύω : šry

ἴσος : šwy

καθέζομαι : qwm

καθόλου : gw', kl

καιρός : zbn

καλέω : qry, šmh'

κάλλος : špr

καλός : špr

κατά : 'yd', 'yn, lpwt

καταλείπω : šbq, šrk

κατασκευή : tqn

κατηγορέω : kny, prš, qtrg

κατηγορία : kny, qt'gryws

κεῖμαι : qb', sym, qwm

κενόν : sprq

κεφαλαιωδῶς : psq

κεφαλή : ryš'

κηρός : qry

κινέω : zw'

κίνησις : zw'

κινητός : zw'

κλίνω : šly

κοινός : gw'

κοινωνέω : šwtp'

κοινωνία : šwtp'

κοινῶς : gw'

κοσμέω : tqn

κόσμος : 'lm', šbt, tqn

κρᾶσις : mzg
 κρείσσων : p'^{''}
 κυρίως : mr'
 λαμβάνω : nsb
 λέγω : 'mr, mll, qry
 λίθος : k'p'
 λόγος : 'mr, mll, tḥwm'
 λοιπός : mkyl
 λύω : šry
 μάθησις : ylp
 μάλιστα : ytr
 μᾶλλον : ytr
 μέγας : sgy, rby
 μέγεθος : rby
 μέθεξις : šwtp'
 μέλλω : 'td
 μένω : ktr, pwš
 μέρος : 'yn, mny
 μέσον : mš'
 μέσος : mš'
 μετά : btr
 μετα- : šhlp
 μεταβάλλω : hlp, šhlp
 μεταβολή : šhlp
 μεταξύ : mš'
 μέτειμι : šwtp'
 μετέχω : šwtp'
 μετουσία : šwtp'
 μέτριος : špr
 μέτρον : mšh, mth
 μηδαμοῦ : dwk
 μήτηρ : 'm'
 μίγνυμι : hlt
 μικρός : z'r
 μῖξις : hlt
 μόλις : hsn
 μονάς : lhd
 μοναχῶς : hḏ
 μόνος : lhd
 μόριον : mny
 μορφή : dmy
 μωρία : bwr

νεῖκος : zky
 νῖκος : zky
 νοέω : skl
 νόημα : ḥšb
 νόησις : yd', r'y
 νοητός : yd'
 νοῦς : hwn'
 νῦν : hš'
 ξηρός : ybš
 ξηρότης : ybš
 οἶδα : ḥkm, yd'
 οἰκεῖος : byt'
 οἰκείως : byt', mr'
 οἶκος : byt'
 οἶομαι : sbr
 οἶον : 'yk, 'yn, m'
 ὀλίγος : z'r
 ὅλος : kl
 ὅλως : kl, swk
 ὁμοιοειδής : dmy
 ὁμοιομερής : dmy
 ὅμοιος : dmy
 ὁμοίως : dmy
 ὁμολογέω : ydy, šlm
 ὁμολογία : šlm
 ὁμοῦ : tnn
 ὄνομα : kny, šm'
 ὀνομάζω : kny, šmh'
 ὀρατός : ḥzy
 ὀράω : ḥzy
 ὀρίζω : prš, tḥwm'
 ὀρισμός : tḥwm'
 ὄρος : tḥwm'
 ὅσος : mdm
 ὅτε : zbn
 ὅτι : mtl
 οὐδαμῶς : swk
 οὐδεῖς : mdm
 οὐδέποτε : mtwm
 οὐδέπω : hkyl
 οὐκέτι : mkyl
 οὐκοῦν : m'

οὖν : hkyl, m'
 οὐπω : hkyl
 οὐρανός : šmy'
 οὐσία : 'wsy'
 οὕτως : kd
 παγετώδης : qrr
 πάθημα : hšš
 παθητικός : hšš
 παθητός : hšš
 πάθος : hšš
 παλαιός : qdm
 πανδεχής : qbl
 πανταχοῦ : dwk
 πάντως : prs
 πάνυ : sgy
 παρά : br', lpwt
 παραδέχομαι : qbl
 παραλαμβάνω : nsb
 παραμένω : ktr
 πάρεμι : nqp, qwm, qrb
 πᾶς : 'khd, mdm
 πάσχω : hšš
 πατήρ : 'b'
 παύω : šly
 πεῖσις : pys
 περαίνω : swk
 πέρας : swk, tḥwm'
 περί : mtl
 περιαιρέω : nsb, rwm
 περιέχω : hbs
 περιλαμβάνω : hbs, lbk
 περιληπτός : yd'
 περιτίθημι : rkb
 πέτρος : k'p'
 πηγή : 'yn
 πίπτω : nzl
 πιστεύω : hymn
 πλείων : sgy
 πλέκω : 'zl, rkb
 πλῆθος : sgy
 πλημμελής : bl
 πλημμελῶς : bl

πνεῦμα : rwh
 ποιέω : 'bd
 ποιητής : p'wt'
 ποιητικός : 'bd
 ποιός : 'yn, zn'
 ποιότης : zn'
 πολὺς : sgy
 πορεύω : rdy
 πόρος : prs
 πόσος : km'
 ποσότης : km'
 ποτέ : mtwm
 πρᾶγμα : šbw
 πρέπω : p''
 πρεσβύτερος : qdm
 πρίν : qdm
 πρό : qdm
 πρό- : qdm
 προαιρέω : rkb
 πρόγνωσης : yd', qdm
 προηγέομαι : qdm
 πρόθεσις : qdm
 προνοέω : qdm, r'y
 πρόνοια : hšb, qdm
 προοράω : hzy, qdm
 προσ- : 'khd
 πρός : lwt, lpwt
 προσδέω : snq
 προσδιορίζω : prš
 προσέρχομαι : 'ty, npq
 προσεχής : qrb
 προσημαίνω : šwd'
 προσλαμβάνω : nsb
 προστίθημι : ysp
 πρότερος : qdm
 προτίθημι : sym
 προφητεύω : š'y
 πρῶτος : qdm, šry
 πῦρ : nwr'
 πυρώδης : nwr'
 ῥέω : rdy
 ῥῆμα : 'mr, mll

ρίζα : 'qr	σχηματίζω : 'skm'
ρίπτω : šdy	σῶμα : gšm, pgr
σαφής : hzy, nhr	σωματόω : gšm
σημαίνω : šwd'	τάξις : tks'
σκέπτομαι : 'qb	τάσσω : tks'
σκληρός : qšy	ταχύς : qll
σκοπός : nyš'	τελευταῖος : 'hr
σπέρμα : zr'	τελευτή : šlm
στάσις : qwm	τελέως : gmr
στερέω : glz	τέλος : nyš', šlm
στέρησις : glz	τέμνω : psq
στηρίζομαι : ktr	τέσσαρες : 'rb'
στοιχεῖον : 'stwks'	τέταρτος : 'rb'
σύγκειμαι : sym	τίθημι : sym
σύγκρισις : pḥm	τιθήνη : rby
συγγέω : plṭ	τιμάω : yqr
συλλογισμός : swlwgyismw	τίς : 'nš', mdm, mn
συμβαίνω : gdš	τοιούτος : 'yk
συμβεβηκός : gdš	τόπος : 'tr', dwk
σμπέρασμα : knš, 'br	τρεις : mth, tlt
σμπληρώω : šmly	τριχῇ : tlt
σμπληρωτικός : šmly	τριχῶς : tlt
σύμφωνος : šlm	τρόπος : zn'
συν- : 'kḥd	τροφή : sybr
συνάγω : nqr	τύπος : twps'
συνᾶδω : knš	ὕγρός : rṭb
συναιρέω : rwm	ὕγροτης : rṭb
συναναιρέω : btḷ	ὕδωρ : my'
συνάπτω : nqr	ὕλη : hwl'
σύνειμι : nqr	ὕλικός : hwl'
συνεχής : 'mn	ὕπαρχω : 'yt, hwy
συνεχῶς : 'mn	ὕπογραφή : thwm'
σύνθεσις : rkb	ὕποδέχομαι : qbl
σύνθετος : rkb	ὕποδοχή : qbl
συνθήκη : šlm	ὕπόθεσις : sym
συνίστημι : qwm	ὕπόκειμαι : sym
συντίθημι : rkb	ὕπολαμβάνω : sbr
σύντομον : psq	ὕπομένω : ktr
σύστασις : qwm	ὕπόστασις : qwm
σύστημα : qwm	ὕποτίθημι : sym
συστοιχία : lḥm	ὕστατος : 'hr
σχῆμα : 'skm'	ὕστερος : 'hr

ὑφίστημι : qwm

φαίνω : hzy

φανερός : hzy, yd'

φθείρω : hbl

φθορά : hbl

φιλία : rhm

φιλοσοφία : pylswp'

φιλόσοφος : pylswp'

φλέβιον : wrd

φλέψ : wrd

φρονέω : sbr, rny, r'y

φυλάσσω : ntr

φυσικός : kwn

φύσις : kwn

φυτόν : nšb

φύω : y'y, kwn

χαλεπός : 'sq

χαλκός : nhš'

χείρων : sny

χθόνιος : 'r'

χράω : hšh

χρεῖος : snq

χρόνος : zbn

χώρα : 'tr', dwk

χωρίς : bl'd

χωριστός : prš

ψυχή : npš

ψυχογονία : yld

ψυχρός : qrr

ψυχρότης : qrr

ᾠσαύτως : dmy

ὥστε : gwn, m'

Proper Names

English	Greek	Syriac	Reference
Anaximenes	Ἀναξίμενης	ܐܢܝܡܝܢܝܬ	§7
Anaxagoras	Ἀναξαγόρας	ܐܢܝܚܐܐܪܐܝܬ	§10
Aristotle	Ἀριστοτέλης	ܐܪܝܬܐܬܐܠܝܬ	§14, 40
Atticus	Ἄττικός	ܐܬܬܝܬܝܬ	§73, 84
Boethus	Βόηθος	ܐܠܬܐܬܐܬ	§95
Democritus	Δημόκριτος	ܕܡܝܬܐܠܝܬܐܬ	§11
Diogenes	Διογένης	ܕܝܐܝܬܐܬ	§7
Empedocles	Ἐμπεδοκλῆς	ܐܡܡܝܬܐܠܝܬܐܬ	§13
Epicurus	Ἐπικούρος	ܐܝܬܝܬܐܬ	§12
Heraclitus	Ἡράκλειτος	ܠܝܬܐܠܝܬܐܬ	§7
Hippasus	Ἴππασος	ܠܝܬܐܠܝܬܐܬ	§7
Leucippus	Λεύκιππος	ܠܝܬܐܠܝܬܐܬ	§11
Longinus	Λογγίνος	ܠܝܬܐܠܝܬܐܬ	§95
Melissus	Μέλισσος	(ܠܝܬܐܠܝܬܐܬ) ܠܝܬܐܠܝܬܐܬ	§9
Oceanus	Ὠκεανός	ܠܝܬܐܠܝܬܐܬ	§6
Parmenides	Παρμενίδης	(ܠܝܬܐܠܝܬܐܬ) ܠܝܬܐܠܝܬܐܬ	§9
Plato	Πλάτων	ܠܝܬܐܠܝܬܐܬ	§16, 36, 40, 41, 68, 73, 75–77, 81, 85–87, 94, 95, 97
Plotinus	Πλωτῖνος	ܠܝܬܐܠܝܬܐܬ	§95
Plutarch	Πλούταρχος	ܠܝܬܐܠܝܬܐܬ	§84
Pythagoreans	οἱ Πυθαγορικοί	ܠܝܬܐܠܝܬܐܬ ܠܝܬܐܠܝܬܐܬ	§16, 36, 40
Severus	Σευήρος	(ܠܝܬܐܠܝܬܐܬ) ܠܝܬܐܠܝܬܐܬ	§87, 94
Socrates	Σωκράτης	ܠܝܬܐܠܝܬܐܬ	§4, 40
Stoics	οἱ Στωϊκοί	ܠܝܬܐܠܝܬܐܬ (ܠܝܬܐܠܝܬܐܬ ܠܝܬܐܠܝܬܐܬ)	§15, 40, 42
Tethys	Τηθύς	ܠܝܬܐܠܝܬܐܬ	§6
Thales	Θαλῆς	ܠܝܬܐܠܝܬܐܬ	§5, 6
Timaeus	Τίμαιος	ܠܝܬܐܠܝܬܐܬ	§77, 87, 95
Xenophanes	Ξενοφάνης	ܠܝܬܐܠܝܬܐܬ	§8

Bibliography

- Addai Scher (ed.), *Theodorus Bar Kōnī Liber scholiorum II* (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 69; Scriptores Syri, 26; Paris, 1954).
- Adler, Ada (ed.), *Suidae Lexicon*, 4 vols. (Lexicographi Graeci, 1.1–4; Leipzig: Teubner, 1928–1935).
- Algra, Keimpe, and Katerina Ierodiakonou, *Sextus Empiricus and Ancient Physics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).
- Allen, Pauline, and C.T.R. Hayward, *Severus of Antioch* (London / New York: Routledge, 2004).
- Altheim, Franz, and Ruth Stiehl, “New Fragments of Greek Philosophers. II: Porphyry in Arabic and Syriac Translation”, *East and West*, N.S., 13 (1962), 3–16.
- Arnzen, Rüdiger (transl.), *Averroes on Aristotle’s Metaphysics: An Annotated Translation of the So-called Epitome* (Scientia Graeco-Arabica, 5; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010).
- Arzhanov, Yuri, “Greek Philosophers in Monastic Schools: Syriac Forms of Doxography”, in Andreas Lammer and Mareike Jas (eds.), *Received Opinions: Doxography in Antiquity and the Islamic World* (Philosophia Antiqua; Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2022), ch. 8, forthcoming.
- Arzhanov, Yuri, “Plato in Syriac Literature”, *Le Muséon*, 132/1–2 (2019), 1–36.
- Arzhanov, Yuri, “Syriac Natural Philosophy in the Early Islamic Period”, *Christian Orient*, New Series, 8 (XIV) (2017), 253–266 (Russian title: Юрий Аржанов, “Сирийская философия природы в раннеисламский период”, *Христианский Восток*, 8 (XIV) (2017), 253–266).
- Arzhanov, Yuri, *Syriac Sayings of Greek Philosophers: A Study in Syriac Gnomologia with Edition and Translation* (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 669; Subsidia, 138; Leuven: Peeters, 2019).
- Arzhanov, Yuri, and Grigory Kessel, “Field Notes on Syriac Manuscripts III: A Previously Unknown Philosophical Manuscript from Alqosh”, *Hugoye: Journal of Syriac Studies*, 23/1 (2020), 99–130.
- Arzhanov, Yuri, and Rüdiger Arnzen, “Die Glossen in Ms. Leyden Or. 583 und die syrische Rezeption der aristotelischen Physik”, in Elisa Coda and Cecilia M. Bonadeo (eds.), *De l’Antiquité tardive au Moyen Age: Mélanges offertes à Henri Hugonnard-Roche* (Études Musulmanes, 44; Paris: Vrin, 2014), 415–463.
- Assemanus, Stephanus Evodius, and Josephus Simonius Assemanus (eds.). *Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae codicum manuscriptorum catalogus in tres partes distributus: In quarum prima Orientales, in altera Graeci in tertia Latini Italici aliorumque Europaeorum idiomatum codices*, Pars I, tomus 3 (Vatican, 1759; reprinted Paris, 1926).
- Aydin, Sami, “The Remnant of a Questions and Answers Commentary on Aristotle’s Categories in Syriac (Vat. Syr. 586)”, *Studia graeco-arabica*, 9 (2019), 69–106.
- Aydin, Sami, *Sergius of Reshaina, Introduction to Aristotle and his Categories, Addressed to Philotheos: Syriac Text, with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (Aristoteles Semitico-Latinus, 24; Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2016).
- Auffret, Thomas, “La doctrine de l’âme”, in Riccardo Chiaradonna and Marwan Rashed (eds.), *Boéthos de Sidon – Exégète d’Aristote et philosophe* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca et Byzantina – Series Academica, 1; Berlin / Boston: De Gruyter, 2020), 361–402.
- Bakoš, Ján (ed.), *Le candélabre du sanctuaire de Grégoire Aboulfaradj dit Barhebraeus* (Patrologia Orientalis, 22/4; Paris: Brepols, 1930).
- Baltes, Matthias, “Zur Philosophie des Platonikers Attikos”, in Horst-Dieter Blume and Friedhelm Mann (eds.), *Platonismus und Christentum: Festschrift für Heinrich Dörrie* (Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum, Ergänzungsband 10; Münster, 1983), 38–57.
- Baltes, Matthias, *Die Weltentstehung des platonischen Timaios nach den antiken Interpreten*, 2 vols. (Philosophia Antiqua, 30; Leiden: Brill, 1976).

- Baltussen, Han, Michael Atkinson, Michael Share, Ian Mueller (transl.), *Simplicius. On Aristotle Physics 1.5-9* (Ancient Commentators on Aristotle; London: Bristol Classical Press, 2012).
- Balty, Jean Charles, "Apamea in Syria in the Second and Third Centuries A.D.," *Journal of Roman Studies*, 78 (1988), 91–104.
- Barnes, Jonathan (transl.), *Aristotle. Posterior Analytics* (Clarendon Aristotle Series; 2nd ed., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).
- Baumstark, Anton, "Griechische Philosophen und ihre Lehren in syrischer Ueberlieferung", *Oriens Christianus*, 5 (1905), 1–25.
- Baumstark, Anton, *Aristoteles bei den Syrern vom V.–VIII. Jahrhundert*. Bd. 1: *Syrisch-Arabische Biographien des Aristoteles; Syrische Commentare zur ΕΙΣΑΓΩΓΗ des Porphyrios* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1900).
- Baumstark, Anton, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur, mit Ausschluss der christlich-palästinensischen Texte* (Bonn, 1922).
- Baumstark, Anton, *Lucubrationes Syro-Graecae* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1894).
- Beck, Edmund, "Ephräms Rede gegen eine philosophische Schrift des Bardaisan übersetzt und erklärt", *Oriens Christianus*, 60 (1976), 24–68.
- Becker, Matthias, *Porphyrios. Contra Christianos: Neue Sammlung der Fragmente, Testimonien und Dubia mit Einleitung, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen* (Texte und Kommentare, 52; Berlin / Boston: De Gruyter, 2016).
- Bergsträsser, Gotthelf, *Ḥunain ibn Ishāq. Über die syrischen und arabischen Galen-Übersetzungen* (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, 17/2; Leipzig: Deutsche morgenländische Gesellschaft, 1925).
- Berti, Vittorio, "Libri e biblioteche cristiane nell'Iraq dell'VIII secolo. Una testimonianza dell'epistolario del patriarca siro-orientale Timoteo I (727–823)", in Cristina D'Ancona Costa (ed.), *The Libraries of the Neoplatonists: Proceedings of the Meeting of the European Science Foundation Network "Late Antiquity and Arabic Thought. Patterns in the Constitution of European Culture" Held in Strasbourg, March 12–14, 2004* (Philosophia Antiqua, 107; Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2007), 307–317.
- Berti, Vittorio, *Vita e studi di Timoteo I († 823), patriarca cristiano di Baghdad: Ricerche sull'epistolario e sulle fonti contigue* (Cahiers de Studia Iranica, 41; Paris, 2009).
- Bett, Richard (transl.), *Sextus Empiricus. Against the Physicists* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).
- Borbone, Pier Giorgio, "Marāgha Mdittā Arškitā: Syriac Christians in Marāgha under Mongol Rule", *Egitto e Vicino Oriente*, 40 (2017), 109–143.
- Bos, Gerrit, and Y. Tzvi Langermann, "An Epitome of Galen's *On The Elements* Ascribed to Ḥunayn Ibn Ishāq", *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy*, 25/1 (2015), 33–78.
- Boys-Stones, George, *Platonist Philosophy 80 BC to AD 250: An Introduction and Collection of Sources in Translation* (Cambridge, 2017).
- Braun, Oscar, "Briefe des Katholikos Timotheos I.", *Oriens Christianus*, 2/1 (1902), 1–32.
- Brisson, Luc, and Michel Patillon, "Longinus Platonicus Philosophus et Philologus", in Wolfgang Haase and Hildegard Temporini (eds.) *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Teil II: *Principat*; Band 36: *Philosophie, Wissenschaft, Technik*, 7. Teilband: *Philosophie* (Berlin / New York: De Gruyter, 1994), 5214–5299; Band 34: *Sprache und Literatur*; 4. Teilband: *Einzelne Autoren seit der hadrianischen Zeit und Allgemeines zur Literatur des 2. und 3. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin / New York: De Gruyter, 1998), 3023–3108.
- Brock, Sebastian, *A Brief Outline of Syriac Literature* (Mōrān 'Eth'ō, 9; Baker Hill, Kottayam: St. Ephrem Ecumenical Research Institute, 1997).
- Brock, Sebastian, "A Syriac Collection of Prophecies of the Pagan Philosophers", *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica*, 14 (1983), 203–246.

- Brock, Sebastian, "Changing Fashions in Syriac Translation Technique: The Background to Syriac Translations under the Abbasids", *Journal of the Canadian Society for Syriac Studies*, 4 (2004), 3–14.
- Brock, Sebastian, "From Antagonism to Assimilation: Syriac Attitudes to Greek Learning", in Nina G. Garsoïan et al. (eds.), *East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period* (Washington, 1982), 17–34 (reprinted with the same pagination in: Sebastian Brock, *Syriac Perspectives on Late Antiquity* (Variorum Series; London, 1984), Ch. VI).
- Brock, Sebastian, "Some Notes on the Syriac Translations of Porphyry's *Eisagoge*", in *Mélanges en hommage F. Jabre* (Beyrouth, 1989), 41–50.
- Brock, Sebastian, "Some Syriac Excerpts from Greek Collections of Pagan Prophecies", *Vigiliae Christianae*, 38 (1984), 77–90.
- Brock, Sebastian, "The Earliest Syriac Translation of Porphyry's *Eisagoge*", *Journal of the Iraqi Academy, Syriac Corporation / Mağma' al-'ilmī al-'Irāqī <Bağdād> / Hay'at al-Luğa as-Suryāniya*, 12 (1988), 316–366.
- Brock, Sebastian (ed.), *The Syriac Version of the Pseudo-Nonnos Mythological Scholia* (University of Cambridge Oriental Publications, 20; London: Cambridge University Press, 1971).
- Brock, Sebastian, "Towards a History of Syriac Translation Technique", in René Lavenant (ed.), *III Symposium Syriacum, 1980: Les contacts du monde syriaque avec les autres cultures (Goslar 7–11 Septembre 1980)* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 221; Rome: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1983), 1–14.
- Brock, Sebastian, "Two Letters of the Patriarch Timothy from the Late Eighth Century on Translations from Greek", *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy*, 9 (1999), 233–246.
- Brock, Sebastian, and Lucas Van Rompay, *Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts and Fragments in the Library of Deir al-Surian, Wadi al-Natrun (Egypt)* (Leuven / Paris: Walpole / Peeters, 2014).
- Brooks, Ernest W. (ed.), *Historia Ecclesiastica Zachariae Rhetori vulgo adscripta*, 2 vols. (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, Scriptores Syri, series III, t. 5–6; Louvain: E Typographeo Reipublicae, 1919, 1921).
- Busse, Adolfus (ed.), *Ammonius in Porphyrii Isagogen sive V voces* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, IV/3; Berlin: Reimer, 1891).
- Butts, Aaron, *Language Change in the Wake of Empire: Syriac in Its Greco-Roman Context* (Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic, 11; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2016).
- Charlton, William (transl.), *Aristotle. Physics. Books I and II* (Clarendon Aristotle Series; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006).
- Chase, Michael, "Porphyry", in Harold Tarrant et al. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Plato in Antiquity* (Brill's Companions to Classical Reception, 13; Leiden et al.: Brill, 2017), 336–350.
- Chiaradonna, Riccardo, "Porphyry's Views on the Immanent Incorporeals", in George Karamanolis and Anne Sheppard (eds.), *Studies on Porphyry* (London: Institute of Classical Studies, University of London, 2007), 35–49.
- Çiçek, Julious Yeshu (ed.), *Mnorath Kudshe (Lamp of the Sanctuary) by Mor Grigorios Yohanna Bar Ebroyo* (Holland: Bar-Hebraeus, 1997).
- Colonna, Maria Elisabetta (ed.), *Enea di Gaza. Teofrasto* (Naples: Iodice, 1958).
- Cornford, Francis M., *Plato's Cosmology: The Timaeus of Plato* (Indianapolis / Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, 1997).
- Cureton, William (ed.), *Kitāb al-mīlāl wa-l-niḥāl: Book of Religious and Philosophical Sects by Muhammad al-Shahrastāni* (London, 1846).
- Cureton, William (ed.), *Spicilegium Syriacum: Containing Remains of Bardesan, Meliton, Ambrose and Mara Bar Serapion* (London, 1855).

- Daiber, Hans, *Aetius Arabus: Die Vorsokratiker in arabischer Überlieferung* (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1980).
- Daiber, Hans, "Die syrische Tradition in frühislamischer Zeit", in Ulrich Rudolph (ed.), *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie: Philosophie in der islamischen Welt*, Bd. 1: 8.–10. Jahrhundert (Basel: Schwabe, 2012), 40–54.
- Daiber, Hans, "Hellenistisch-kaiserzeitliche Doxographie und philosophischer Synkretismus in islamischer Zeit", in Wolfgang Haase (ed.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*, Teil II: *Der Principat*; Band 36/7: *Philosophie, Wissenschaften, Technik* (Berlin / New York: De Gruyter, 1994), 4974–4992.
- De Haas, Frans A. J., *John Philoponus' New Definition of Prime Matter: Aspects of Its Background in Neoplatonism and the Ancient Commentary Tradition* (*Philosophia Antiqua*, 69; Leiden et al.: Brill, 1997).
- De Lacy, Phillip (ed.), *Galen De elementis ex Hippocratis sententia / Galen. On the Elements according to Hippocrates: Edition, Translation and Commentary* (*Corpus Medicorum Graecorum*, V/1/2; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1996).
- De Lagarde, Paul (ed.), *Analecta Syriaca* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1858).
- Den Heijer, Johannes, "Les Patriarches coptes d'origine syrienne", in Rifaat Y. Ebied and Herman G.B. Teule (eds.), *Studies on the Christian Arabic Heritage in Honour of Father Prof. Dr. Samir Khalil Samir S.I. at the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (*Eastern Christian Studies*, 5; Leuven / Paris / Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2004), 45–63.
- Des Places, Édouard (ed.), *Atticus. Fragments* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1977).
- Des Places, Édouard (ed.), *Porphyre. Vie de Pythagore, Lettre à Marcella* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1982).
- Deuse, Werner, *Untersuchungen zur mittelplatonischen und neuplatonischen Seelenlehre* (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1983).
- Diehl, Ernst (ed.), *Procli Diadochi in Platonis Timaeum commentaria*, 3 vols. (*Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana*; Leipzig: Teubner, 1903–1906).
- Diels, Hermann (ed.), *Simplicii In Aristotelis Physicorum libros quattuor priores commentaria* (*Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca*, 9; Berlin: Reimer, 1882).
- Diels, Hermann, *Doxographi Graeci* (Berlin: Reimer, 1879).
- Dillon, John (ed.), *Alcinous. The Handbook of Platonism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).
- Dillon, John, "Boéthos" [no. 43], in Richard Goulet (ed.), *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, vol. 2 (Paris: CNRS, 1994), 122.
- Dillon, John, *The Middle Platonists: A Study of Platonism, 80 B.C. to A.D. 220* (London: Duckworth, 1977).
- Dorandi, Tiziano (ed.), *Diogenes Laertius, Lives of Eminent Philosophers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).
- Dörrie, Heinrich, *Platonica Minora* (München: Fink, 1976).
- Dörrie, Heinrich, and Matthias Baltes, *Der Platonismus im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert nach Christus: Bausteine 73–100: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (*Der Platonismus in der Antike*, 3; Stuttgart, 1993).
- Drijvers, Han J.W., *Bardaisan of Edessa*, tr. Gertrud E. van Baaren-Pape (*Studia Semitica Neerlandica*, 6; Assen, 1966).
- Dyck, Andrew R., "Notes on Platonic Lexicography in Antiquity", *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 89 (1985), 75–88.
- Edwards, Mark (transl.), *Neoplatonic Saints: The Lives of Plotinus and Proclus by their Students* (*Translated Texts for Historians*, 35; Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000).
- Endress, Gerhard, "Alexander Arabus on the First Cause: Aristotle's First Mover in an Arabic Treatise Attributed to Alexander of Aphrodisias", in Cristina D'Ancona et al. (eds.), *Aristotele e*

- Alessandro di Afrodisia nella tradizione araba: *Atti del colloquio La ricezione araba ed ebraica della filosofia e della scienza greche, Padova, 14–15 maggio 1999* (Padova: Il Poligrafo, 2002), 19–74.
- Endress, Gerhard, “Philosophie und Wissenschaften bei den Syrern”, in Wolfdietrich Fischer and Helmut Gätje (eds.), *Grundriss der arabischen Philologie*, Bd. 2: *Literaturwissenschaft* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1987), 407–412.
- Fiori, Emiliano, “L’épitomé syriaque du traité sur les causes du tout d’Alexandre d’Aphrodise attribué à Serge de Reš‘aynā”, *Le Muséon*, 123/1–2 (2010), 127–58.
- Fiori, Emiliano, “Un intellectuel alexandrin en Mésopotamie: Essai d’une interprétation d’ensemble de l’oeuvre de Serge de Resh‘ayna”, in Elisa Coda and Cecilia M. Bonadeo (eds.), *De l’Antiquité tardive au Moyen Age: Mélanges offertes à Henri Hugonnard-Roche* (Études Musulmanes, 44; Paris: Vrin, 2014), 59–90.
- Fiori, Emiliano, and Henri Hugonnard-Roche (eds.), *La philosophie en syriaque* (Études syriaques, 16; Paris: Geuthner, 2019).
- Flügel, Gustav (ed.), *Kitāb al-Fihrist*, 2 vols. (Leipzig: Vogel, 1871–1872).
- Fortenbaugh, William W., et al. (eds.), *Theophrastus of Eresus: Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought and Influence*, 2 vols. (Philosophia Antiqua, 54; Leiden / New York: Brill, 1992).
- Frankenberg, Wilhelm, *Evagrius Ponticus* (Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse; Neue Folge, Bd. 13, Nr. 2; Berlin, 1912).
- Freimann, Aron (ed.), *Die Isagoge des Porphyrius in den syrischen Übersetzungen* (Inaugural-Dissertation; Berlin, 1897).
- Furlani, Giuseppe, “Contributi alla storia della filosofia greca in Oriente: Testi siriaci, III: Frammenti di una versione siriana del commento di Pseudo-Olimpodoro alle Categorie d’Aristotele”, *Rivista degli Studi Orientali*, 7/1 (1916), 131–163.
- Furlani, Giuseppe, “Contributions to the History of Greek Philosophy in the Orient, Syriac Texts, IV: A Syriac Version of the λόγος κεφαλαίων περὶ ψυχῆς πρὸς Τατιανόν of Gregory Thaumaturgus”, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 35 (1915), 297–317.
- Furlani, Giuseppe, “Due scolii filosofici attribuiti a Sergio di Teodosiopolis (Rêš‘aynā)”, *Aegyptus*, 7 (1926), 139–145.
- Furlani, Giuseppe, “Il trattato di Sergio di Rêsh‘ainā sull’universo”, *Rivista trimestrale di studi filosofici e religiosi*, 4 (1923), 1–22.
- Furlani, Giuseppe (ed.), “Le Categorie e gli Ermeneutici di Aristotele nella versione siriana di Giorgio delle Nazioni”, *Atti dell’Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Classe di Scienze morali storiche e filologiche, Memorie*, 6/5/1 (1933), 1–68.
- Furlani, Giuseppe, “Sul trattato di Sergio di Rêsh‘ainā circa le categorie”, *Rivista trimestrale di studi filosofici e religiosi*, 3 (1922), 135–172.
- Furlani, Giuseppe, “Sur le stoïcisme de Bardesane d’Édesse”, *Archiv Orientalní*, 9:3 (1937), 347–352.
- Genequand, Charles (ed.), *Alexander of Aphrodisias On the Cosmos* (Leiden: Brill, 2001).
- Georr, Khalîl (ed.), *Les Catégories d’Aristote dans leurs versions syro-arabes* (Beirut, 1948).
- Gertz, Sebastian, John Dillon, and Donald Russell (transl.), *Aeneas of Gaza: Theophrastus with Zacharias of Mytilene: Ammonius* (London: Bloomsbury, 2012).
- Gioè, Adriano, “Il medioplatonico Severo: Testimonianze e frammenti”, *Annali dell’Istituto Italiano per gli studi storici*, 12 (1991/1994), 405–437.
- Gioè, Adriano, *Filosofi medioplatonici del II secolo D.C.: Testimonianze e frammenti. Gaio, Albino, Lucio, Nicostato, Tauro, Severo, Arpocrasione* (Napoli: Bibliopolis, 2002).
- Gottheil, Richard J.H., “A Synopsis of Greek Philosophy by Bar ‘Ebhryā”, *Hebraica*, 3/4 (1887), 249–254.

- Gottschalk, Hans B., "Boethus' Psychology and the Neoplatonists", *Phronesis*, 31 (1986), 243–257.
- Goulet, Richard (ed.), *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, vol. 2 (Paris: CNRS, 1994).
- Goulet, Richard, "Severus", in Richard Goulet (ed.), *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, vol. 6 (Paris: CNRS, 2016), 236–241.
- Gourinat, Jean-Baptiste, "The Stoics on Matter and Prime Matter: 'Corporealism' and the Imprint of Plato's Timaeus", in Ricardo Salles (ed.), *God and Cosmos in Stoicism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 46–70.
- Graffin, François (ed.), *Le Candélabre du Sanctuaire de Grégoire Abou'lfaradj dit Barhebraeus. Troisième base: De la théologie* (Patrologia Orientalis, 27/4; Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1957).
- Greatrex, Geoffrey, et al. (eds.), *The Chronicle of Pseudo-Zachariah Rhetor: Church and War in Late Antiquity* (Translated Texts for Historians, 55; Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2011).
- Gregorić, Pavel, and George Karamanolis, *Pseudo-Aristotle: De Mundo (On the Cosmos). A Commentary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020).
- Grillmeier, Alois, and Theresia Hainthaler, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, transl. by John Cawte and Pauline Allen, vol. 2, part 2 (London: Oxford University Press, 1995).
- Guillaumont, Antoine, and Claire Guillaumont (eds.), *Le gnostique, ou A celui qui est devenu digne de la science. Édition critique des fragments grecs, traduction intégrale établie au moyen des versions syriaques et arménienne Évangile le Pontique* (Sources chrétiennes, 356; Paris: Cerf, 1989).
- Gutas, Dimitri, *Greek Thought, Arabic Culture: The Graeco-Arabic Translation Movement in Baghdad and Early 'Abbāsīd Society (2nd–4th/8th–10th centuries)* (London / New York: Routledge, 1998).
- Gutas, Dimitri, "Paul the Persian on the Classification of the Parts of Aristotle's Philosophy: a Milestone Between Alexandria and Bagdad", *Der Islam*, 60 (1983), 231–267.
- Hadot, Pierre-Henri, *Porphyre et Victorinus*, 2 vols. (Paris: Études augustinienes, 1968).
- Hadot, Pierre-Henri, "Fragments d'un commentaire de Porphyre sur le Parménide", *Revue des Études Grecques*, 74 (1961), 410–438.
- Hatch, William H.P., *An Album of Dated Syriac Manuscripts* (Boston: American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1946).
- Hausherr, Irénée, "Un grand auteur spirituel retrouvé: Jean d'Apamée", *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 14/1-2 (1948), 3–42.
- Havrdá, Matyáš, *The So-Called Eighth 'Stromateus' by Clement of Alexandria: Early Christian Reception of Greek Scientific Methodology* (Philosophia Antiqua, 144; Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2016).
- Heimgartner, Martin, "Der ostsyrische Patriarch Timotheos I. (780–823) und der Aristotelismus: Die aristotelische Logik und Dialektik als Verständigungsbasis zwischen den Religionen", in Martin Tamcke (ed.), *Orientalische Christen und Europa: Kulturbegrenzung zwischen Interferenz, Partizipation und Antizipation* (Göttinger Orientforschungen, I; Reihe: Syriaca, 41; Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz, 2012), 11–22.
- Heimgartner, Martin (ed.), *Die Briefe 42–58 des ostsyrischen Patriarchen Timotheos I.: Textedition* (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 644; Scriptores Syri, 248; Leuven: Peeters, 2012).
- Heimgartner, Martin (transl.), *Die Briefe 42–58 des ostsyrischen Patriarchen Timotheos I.: Einleitung, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen* (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 645; Scriptores Syri, 249; Leuven: Peeters, 2012).
- Hein, Christel, *Definition und Einteilung der Philosophie: Von der spätantiken Einleitungsliteratur zur arabischen Enzyklopädie* (Europäische Hochschulschriften, 177; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1985)

- Henry, Paul, and Hans-Rudolf Schwyzer (eds.), *Plotini Opera*, Tomus I: *Porphyrii Vita Plotini. Enneades I-III* (Paris / Bruxelles, 1951).
- Hespel, Robert (ed.), *Théodore bar Koni, Livre des scolies (recension d'Urmiah): Les collections annexées par Sylvain de Qardu* (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 464; Scriptores Syri, 197; Leuven: Peeters, 1984).
- Hespel, Robert, and René Draguet (eds.), *Theodore bar Konai, Livre des scolies: Recension de Séert. II: Mimrè VI–XI* (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 432; Scriptores Syri, 188; Leuven, 1982).
- Hicks, Robert Drew (transl.), *Diogenes Laertius. Lives of Eminent Philosophers, Volume II, Books 6–10* (Loeb Classical Library, 185; London / New York, 1925).
- Hoffmann, Johann G.E. (ed.), *De Hermeneuticis apud Syros Aristoteleis* (Lipsiae, 1873).
- Horstschäfer, Titus Maria, *‘Über Prinzipien’: Eine Untersuchung zur methodischen und inhaltlichen Geschlossenheit des ersten Buches der Physik des Aristoteles* (Quellen und Studien zur Philosophie, 47; Berlin / New York: De Gruyter, 1998).
- Hugonnard-Roche, Henri, “Aux origines de l’exégèse orientale et la logique d’Aristote: Sergius de Reš’aina, médecin et philosophe”, *Journal Asiatique*, 277 (1989), 1–17.
- Hugonnard-Roche, Henri, “Die Schule von Keneschre”, in Christoph Riedweg et al. (eds.), *Die Philosophie der Antike*, Bd. 5/3: *Philosophie der Kaiserzeit und der Spätantike* (Basel: Schwabe, 2018), 2469–2474.
- Hugonnard-Roche, Henri, “L’épître de Sévère Sebokht à Aitilaha sur le *Peri Hermeneias*: À propos des propositions métathétiques et privatives, et de l’existence du possible”, in A. Straface et al. (eds.), *Labor Limae: Atti in onore di Carmela Baffioni*, tomo I (Studi Magrebini, 12; Napoli: Università degli Studi di Napoli ‘L’Orientale’, Dipartimento Asia Africa e Mediterraneo, 2017), 337–366.
- Hugonnard-Roche, Henri, “La scienza siriana. IV. Matematica e astronomia”, in Sandro Petruccioli (ed.), *Storia della scienza*, IV: *Medioevo Rinascimento* (Rome, 2001), 36–41, 69–70.
- Hugonnard-Roche, Henri, “La constitution de la logique tardo-antique et l’élaboration d’une logique ‘matérielle’ en syriaque”, in Vincenza Celluprica and Cristina D’Ancona (eds.), *Aristotele e i suoi esegeti neoplatonici: Logica e ontologia nelle interpretazioni greche e arabe. Atti del Convegno internazionale Roma 19–20 ottobre 2001* (Napoli: Bibliopolis, 2004), 55–83.
- Hugonnard-Roche, Henri, *La logique d’Aristote du grec au syriaque: Études sur la transmission des textes de l’Organon et leur interprétation philosophique* (Textes et traditions, 9; Paris: Vrin, 2004).
- Hugonnard-Roche, Henri, “Le corpus philosophique syriaque aux VIe-VIIe siècles”, in Cristina D’Ancona (ed.), *The Libraries of the Neoplatonists* (Philosophia Antiqua, 107; Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2007), 279–291.
- Hugonnard-Roche, Henri, “Les traductions syriaques de l’*Isagoge* de Porphyre et la constitution du corpus syriaque de logique”, *Revue d’histoire des textes*, 24 (1994), 293–312.
- Hugonnard-Roche, Henri, “Note sur Sergius de Rēš’ainā, traducteur du grec en syriaque et commentateur d’Aristote”, in Gerhard Endress and Remke Kruk (eds.), *The Ancient Tradition in Christian and Islamic Hellenism: Studies on the Transmission of Greek Philosophy and Sciences Dedicated to H. J. Drossaart Lulofs on His Ninetieth Birthday* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 121–143.
- Hugonnard-Roche, Henri, “Porphyre de Tyr, *Isagogè*: Traduction syriaque”, in Richard Goulet (ed.), *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, vol. 5/2 (Paris: CNRS, 2012), 1450–1453.
- Hugonnard-Roche, Henri, “Questions de logique au VIIe siècle: Les épîtres syriaques de Sévère Sebokht et leurs sources grecques”, *Studia Graeco-Arabica*, 5 (2015), 53–104.

- Hugonnard-Roche, Henri, and John Watt, "Philosophie im syrischen Sprachbereich", in Christoph Riedweg et al. (eds.), *Die Philosophie der Antike*, Bd. 5: *Philosophie der Kaiserzeit und der Spätantike* (Basel: Schwabe, 2018), 2445–2488.
- Janáček, Karel, "Hippolytus and Sextus Empiricus", *Listy Filologické*, 82, Suppl. *Eunomia* 3 (1959), 19–21.
- Kamil, Murad, *Catalogue of the Syrian Manuscripts Newly Found in the Monastery of St. Mary Deipara in the Nitrian Desert* (unpublished).
- Karamanolis, George, *Plato and Aristotle in Agreement? Platonists on Aristotle from Antiochus to Porphyry* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006).
- Karamanolis, George, "Why Did Porphyry Write Aristotelian Commentaries?", in Benedikt Strobel (ed.), *Die Kunst der philosophischen Exegese bei den spätantiken Platon- und Aristoteles-Kommentatoren* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2018), 9–44.
- Karamanolis, George, *The Philosophy of Early Christianity* (Durham: Acumen, 2013).
- Karamanolis, George, and Anne Sheppard (eds.), *Studies on Porphyry* (London: Institute of Classical Studies, University of London, 2007).
- Keil, Henric (ed.), *Grammatici latini*, vol. 6, part 2 (Leipzig: Teubner, 1857).
- Khoury, Joseph (ed.), *Le Candélabre du Sanctuaire de Grégoire Abou'lfaradj dit Barhebraeus. Quatrième base: De l'incarnation* (Patrologia Orientalis, 31/1; Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1964).
- Kindt, Bastien, Jean-Claude Haelewyck, Andrea Schmidt and Nicolas Atas, "La concordance bilingue grecque-syriaque des Discours de Grégoire de Nazianze", *BABELAO*, 7 (2018), 51–80.
- King, Daniel, "Alexander of Aphrodisias' *On the Principles of the Universe* in a Syriac Adaptation", *Le Muséon*, 123/1–2 (2010), 159–191.
- King, Daniel, "Origenism in Sixth Century Syria: The Case of a Syriac Manuscript of Pagan Philosophy", in Alfons Fürst (ed.), *Origenes und sein Erbe in Orient und Okzident* (Adamantina, 1; Münster: Aschendorff, 2010), 179–212.
- King, Daniel, *The Earliest Syriac Translation of Aristotle's Categories: Text, Translation and Commentary* (Aristoteles Semitico-Latinus, 21; Leiden: Brill, 2010).
- Koch, Hal, *Pronoia und Paideusis: Studien über Origenes und sein Verhältnis zum Platonismus* (Berlin / Leipzig: De Gruyter, 1932).
- Kroll, Wilhelm, "Ein neuplatonischer Parmenidescommentar in einem Turiner Palimpsest", *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, N.F., 47 (1892), 599–627.
- Kutsch, Wilhelm, "Ein arabisches Bruchstück aus Porphyrios (?), Περὶ ψυχῆς, und die Frage des Verfassers der «Theologie des Aristoteles»", *Mélanges de l'Université Saint Joseph*, 31/4 (Beyrouth: Imprimerie Catholique, 1954), 265–286.
- Lamberg, Erich (ed.), *Porphyrius. Sententiae ad intelligibilia ducentes* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana; Leipzig: Teubner, 1975).
- Lamoreaux, John C. (ed.), *Hunayn ibn Isḥāq on His Galen Translations* (Eastern Christian Texts; Provo, UT: Brigham Young University Press, 2016).
- Leicht, Reimund, and Giuseppe Veltri, "The Study of Pre-Modern Philosophical and Scientific Hebrew Terminology – Past, Present and Future Perspectives", in Reimund Leicht and Giuseppe Veltri (eds.), *Studies in the Formation of Medieval Hebrew Philosophical Terminology* (Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2019), 1–35.
- Lewis, Agnes S., *Catalogue of the Syriac MSS. in the Convent of St. Catharine on the Mount Sinai* (Studia Sinaitica, 1; London, 1894).
- Lippert, Julius (ed.), *Ibn al-Qifṭī's Ta'riḥ al-Ḥukamā'* (Leipzig, 1903).
- Litwa, M. David (transl.), *Refutation of All Heresies* (Writings from the Greco-Roman World, 40; Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016).
- Männlein-Robert, Irmgard, *Longin, Philologe und Philosoph: Eine Interpretation der erhaltenen Zeugnisse* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 143; München / Leipzig: Saur, 2001).

- Mansfeld, Jaap, “Doxography and Dialectic: The *Sitz im Leben* of the ‘Placita’”, in Wolfgang Haase (ed.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Teil II: *Der Principat*, Band 36/4: *Philosophie* (Berlin / New York: De Gruyter, 1990), 3056–3229.
- Mansfeld, Jaap, *Heresiography in Context: Hippolytus’ Elenchos as a Source for Greek Philosophy* (Philosophia Antiqua, 56; Leiden et al.: Brill, 1992).
- Mansfeld, Jaap, *Prolegomena: Questions to be Settled before the Study of an Author, or a Text* (Philosophia Antiqua, 61; Leiden / New York: Brill, 1994).
- Mansfeld, Jaap, and David T. Runia, *Aëtiana: The Method and Intellectual Context of a Doxographer*, vol. 1: *The Sources* (Philosophia Antiqua, 73; Leiden: Brill, 1996).
- Mansfeld, Jaap, and David T. Runia (eds.), *Aëtiana V: An Edition of the Reconstructed Text of the Placita with a Commentary and a Collection of Related Texts*, 4 vols. (Philosophia Antiqua, 153; Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2020).
- Marcovich, Miroslav (ed.), *Hippolytus. Refutatio omnium haeresium* (Patristische Texte und Studien, 25; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1986).
- Markovich, Miroslav (ed.), *Pseudo-Iustinus. Cohortatio ad Graecos, De Monarchia, Oratio ad Graecos* (Patristische Texte und Studien, 32; Berlin / New York: De Gruyter, 1990).
- McCollum, Adam, *A Greek and Syriac Index to Sergius of Resh’ayna’s Version of De Mundo* (Gorgias Handbooks, 12; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2009).
- McCollum, Adam, *The Syriac De Mundo: Translation, Commentary, and Analysis of Translation Technique* (Ph.D. dissertation, Hebrew Union College – Jewish Institute of Religion, Ohio, 2009).
- McVey, Kathleen E., “A Fresh Look at the Letter of Mara Bar Sarapion to his Son”, in René Lavenant (ed.), *V Symposium Syriacum, 1988: Katholieke Universiteit, Leuven, 29–31 août 1988* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 236; Roma: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1990), 257–272.
- Merz, Annette, and Teun Tieleman (eds.), *The Letter of Mara bar Sarapion in Context: Proceedings of the Symposium Held at Utrecht University, 10–12 December 2009* (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East, 58; Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2012).
- Meyerhof, Max, “Von Alexandrien nach Bagdad: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des philosophischen und medizinischen Unterrichts bei den Arabern”, *Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse* (Berlin, 1930), 389–429.
- Michalewski, Alexandra, “Atticus et le nombre des principes: Nouvel examen de quelques problèmes textuels du fragment DP 26 (= Proclus, In Tim., I 391.6–12 Diehl)”, in Marc-Antoine Gavray and Alexandra Michalewski (eds.), *Les principes cosmologiques du platonisme: Origines, influences et systématisation* (Monothéismes et Philosophie, 23; Turnhout: Brepols, 2017), 119–141.
- Miller, Dana R., “Sargis of Rešaina: On What the Celestial Bodies Know”, in René Lavenant (ed.), *VI Symposium Syriacum, 1992: University of Cambridge, Faculty of Divinity, 30 August – 2 September 1992* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 247; Roma: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1994), 221–233.
- Mitchell, C.W., et al. (eds.), *S. Ephraim’s Prose Refutations of Mani, Marcion, and Bardaisan*, 2 vols. (London / Oxford, 1921).
- Moreschini, Claudio (ed.), *Apulei Platonici Madaurensis opera quae supersunt*, vol. 3: *De philosophia libri* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana; Stuttgart / Leipzig: Teubner 1991).
- Moreschini, Claudio, “Attico: Una figura singolare del medioplatonismo”, in Wolfgang Haase and Hildegard Temporini (eds.) *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Teil II: *Principat*, Band 36: *Philosophie, Wissenschaft, Technik*, 1. Teilband: *Philosophie* (Berlin / New York: De Gruyter, 1987), 477–491.

- Mras, Karl, and Édouard des Places (eds.), *Eusebius Werke*, 8. Band: *Die Praeparatio Evangelica*; Teil 2: *Die Bücher XI bis XV, Register* (Die griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte, 43/2; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1983).
- Mutschmann, Hermann (ed.), *Sextus Empiricus. Opera*, vol. 2: *Adversus dogmaticos. Libros quinque (Adv. mathem. VII–XI) continens* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1914).
- Nau, François, “Le traité sur l’astrolabe plan de Sévère Sabokt, écrit au VII^e siècle d’après des sources grecques, et publié pour la première fois d’après un ms. de Berlin”, *Journal asiatique*, 9/13 (1899), 56–101, 238–303.
- Nau, François, “Le traité sur les constellations écrit en 660, par Sévère Sébokt, évêque de Qennešrin”, *Révue de l’Orient Chrétien*, 27 (1929/30), 343–410; 28 (1931/32), 85–100.
- Nimmo Smith, Jennifer (transl.), *A Christian’s Guide to Greek Culture: The Pseudo-Nonnus Commentaries on Sermons 4, 5, 39 and 43 by Gregory of Nazianzus* (Translated Texts for Historians, 37; Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2001).
- Nimmo Smith, Jennifer (ed.), *Pseudo-Nonniani in IV Orationes Gregorii Nazianzeni Commentarii. Collationibus* (Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca, 27; Corpus Nazianzenum, 2; Turnhout: Brepols, 1992).
- O’Brien, Denis, “Plotinus on Matter and Evil”, in Lloyd P. Gerson (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Plotinus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 171–195.
- Osborne, Catherine, *Rethinking Early Greek Philosophy: Hippolytus of Rome and the Presocratics* (London: Duckworth, 1987).
- Overwien, Oliver, “Der medizinische Unterricht der *Iatrosofisten* in der ‚Schule von Alexandria‘ (5.–7. Jh. n.Chr.): Überlegungen zu seiner Organisation, seinen Inhalten und seinen Ursprüngen”, *Philologus*, 162 (2018), 2–14, 265–290.
- Overwien, Oliver, *Medizinische Lehrwerke aus dem spätantiken Alexandria: Die Tabulae Vindobonenses und Summaria Alexandrinorum zu Galens De sectis* (Scientia Graeco-Arabica, 24; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2019).
- Overwien, Oliver, “Secundus der schweigende Philosoph: Ein Leben zwischen Mythos und Kosmos”, *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft*, N.F. 28b (2004), 105–129.
- Phillips, George, *A Letter by Mār Jacob, Bishop of Edessa, on Syriac Orthography; Also a Tract by the Same Author, and a Discourse by Gregory Bar Hebræus on Syriac Accents Now Edited, in the Original Syriac, from MSS. in the British Museum, with an English Translation and Notes* (London / Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate, 1869).
- Pognon, Henri, *Une version syriaque des aphorismes d’Hippocrate* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1903).
- Possekel, Ute, “Bardaisan of Edessa: Philosopher or Theologian?”, *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum / Journal of Ancient Christianity*, 10/3 (2007), 442–461.
- Possekel, Ute, *Evidence of Greek Philosophical Concepts in the Writings of Ephrem the Syrian* (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 580; Subsidia, 102; Leuven: Peeters, 1999).
- Rabe, Hugo (ed.), *Ioannes Philoponus. De Aeternitate mundi contra Proclum* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1899).
- Ramelli, Ilaria, *Bardaisan of Edessa: A Reassessment of the Evidence and a New Interpretation* (Gorgias Eastern Christian Studies, 22; Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2009).
- Reich, Edgar, “Ein Brief des Severus Sebōkt”, in Menso Folkerts and Richard Lorch (eds.), *Sic itur ad astra: Studien zur Geschichte der Mathematik und Naturwissenschaften. Festschrift für den Arabisten Paul Kunitzsch zum 70. Geburtstag* (Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz, 2000), 478–489.
- Reinink, Gerrit J., “Severos Sebokht”, in Sebastian P. Brock et al. (eds.), *The Gorgias Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Syriac Heritage* (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2011), 368.
- Reinink, Gerrit J., “Severus Sebokts Brief an den Periodeutes Jonan. Einige Fragen zur aristotelischen Logik”, in René Lavenant (ed.), *Illo Symposium Syriacum, 1980: Les contacts du*

- monde syriaque avec les autres cultures (Goslar 7–11 Septembre 1980)* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 221; Roma: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1983), 97–107.
- Rist, John M., “Mysticism and Transcendence in Later Neoplatonism”, *Hermes*, 92/2 (1964), 213–225.
- Rodríguez, Carlos Quirós (ed.), *Averroes. Compendio de Metafísica: Texto árabe con traducción y notas* (Madrid: Maestre, 1919).
- Rudolph, Ulrich, *Die Doxographie des Pseudo-Ammonios: Ein Beitrag zur neuplatonischen Überlieferung im Islam* (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, 59/1; Stuttgart, 1989).
- Runia, David T., “What is Doxography?”, in Philip J. van der Eijk (ed.), *Ancient Histories of Medicine: Essays in Medical Doxography and Historiography in Classical Antiquity* (Studies in Ancient Medicine, 20; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 33–55.
- Runia, David T., and Michael Share (eds.), *Proclus. Commentary on Plato’s Timaeus*, Volume 2, Book 2: *Proclus on the Causes of the Cosmos and its Creation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017).
- Ryssel, Victor, *Über den textkritischen Werth der syrischen Übersetzungen griechischer Klassiker*, Teile 1–2 (Leipzig: Dürr, 1880–1881).
- Sachau, Eduard, *Verzeichniss der syrischen Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*, 2 vols. (Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin, 23; Berlin: Asher & Co., 1899).
- Saffrey, Henri-Dominique, and Leendert G. Westerink (eds.), *Proclus. Théologie platonicienne, Livre I* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1968).
- Şālihānī, Anṭūn (ed.), *Abū l-Faraǧ Ǧrǧūriyūs Ibn al-ʿIbrī. Taʾrīḥ Muḥtaṣar al-Duwal* (Bayrūt, 1890).
- Scholten, Clemens (ed.), *Theodoret. De Graecarum affectionum curatione: Heilung der griechischen Krankheiten* (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae, 126; Leiden et al.: Brill, 2015).
- Schulthess, Friedrich, “Der Brief des Mara bar Sarapion (Spicilegium Syriacum ed. Cureton p. 43 ff.). Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der syrischen Litteratur”, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 51 (1897), 365–391.
- Share, Michael (transl.), *Philoponus. Against Proclus on the Eternity of the World 6–8* (Ancient Commentators on Aristotle, Bloomsbury Collections; London: Duckworth, 2005).
- Siniosoglou, Niketas, *Plato and Theodoret: The Christian Appropriation of Platonic Philosophy and the Hellenic Intellectual Resistance* (Cambridge Classical Studies; Cambridge / New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
- Smith, Andrew (ed.), *Porphyrii Philosophi Fragmenta*. Fragmenta Arabica David Wasserstein interpretante (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana; Stuttgart / Leipzig: Teubner, 1993).
- Smith, Andrew, *Porphyry’s Place in the Neoplatonic Tradition. A Study in post-Plotinian Neoplatonism* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1974).
- Smith, Andrew, “The Significance of ‘Physics’ in Porphyry: The Problem of Body and Matter”, in James Wilberding and Christoph Horn (eds.), *Neoplatonism and the Philosophy of Nature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 30–43.
- Sodano, Angelo R. (ed.), *Porphyrii in Platonis Timaeum commentariorum fragmenta* (Napoli, 1964).
- Sokoloff, Michael, *A Syriac Lexicon: A Translation from Latin, Correction, Expansion, and Update of C. Brockelmann’s Lexicon Syriacum* (Winona Lake / Piscataway: Eisenbrauns / Gorgias Press, 2009).
- Strothmann, Werner, *Johannes von Apamea. Sechs Gespräche mit Thomasios, Der Briefwechsel zwischen Thomasios und Johannes und Drei an Thomasios gerichtete Abhandlungen* (Patristische Texte und Studien, 11; Berlin / New York: De Gruyter, 1972).

- Stüve, Guilelmus (ed.), *Olympiodori in Aristotelis Meteora Commentaria* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, 12/2; Berlin: Reimer, 1900).
- Takahashi, Hidemi (ed.), *Aristotelian Meteorology in Syriac: Barhebraeus, Butyrum Sapientiae, Books of Mineralogy and Meteorology* (Aristoteles Semitico-Latinus, 15; Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2004).
- Takahashi, Hidemi, *Barhebraeus: A Bio-Bibliography* (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2005).
- Takahashi, Hidemi, "Between Greek and Arabic: The Sciences in Syriac from Severus Sebokht to Barhebraeus", in Haruo Kobayashi and Mizue Kato (eds.), *Transmission of Sciences: Greek, Syriac, Arabic and Latin* (Tokyo: Organization for Islamic Area Studies, Waseda University (WIAS), 2010), 16–39.
- Takahashi, Hidemi, "Syriac and Arabic Transmission of *On the Cosmos*", in Johan C. Thom (ed.), *Cosmic Order and Divine Power: Pseudo-Aristotle, On the Cosmos* (Scripta Antiquitatis Posterioris ad Ethicam Religionemque pertinentia, 23; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 155–169.
- Takahashi, Hidemi, "The Greco-Syriac and Arabic Sources of Barhebraeus' Mineralogy and Meteorology in *Candelabrum Sanctuarii*, Base II", *Journal of Eastern Christian Studies*, 54 (2005), 191–209.
- Takahashi, Hidemi, "The Mathematical Sciences in Syriac: From Sergius of Resh-'Aina and Severus Sebokht to Barhebraeus and Patriarch Ni'mattallah", *Annals of Science*, 68 (2011), 477–491.
- Tanaseanu-Döbler, Ilinca, "Bemerkungen zu Porphyrios und Bardaisan", *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum / Journal of Ancient Christianity*, 19/1 (2015), 26–68.
- Tannous, Jack, *The Making of the Medieval Middle East: Religion, Society, and Simple Believers* (Princeton, NJ / Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2018).
- Tannous, Jack, "You are What you Read: Qenneshre and the Miaphysite Church in the Seventh Century," in Philip Wood (ed.), *History and Identity in the Late Antique Near East* (Oxford, 2013), 83–102.
- Taylor, Thomas (transl.), *Proclus' Theology of Plato* (The Thomas Taylor Series, 8; London: Prometheus Trust, 1995, reprint of the 1816 edition).
- Thom, Johan C., "Introduction", in id. (ed.), *Cosmic Order and Divine Power: Pseudo-Aristotle, On the Cosmos* (Scripta Antiquitatis Posterioris ad Ethicam Religionemque pertinentia, 23; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 3–17.
- Trabattoni, Franco, "Boéthos de Sidon et l'immortalité de l'âme dans le *Phédon*", in Riccardo Chiaradonna and Marwan Rashed (eds.), *Boéthos de Sidon – Exégète d'Aristote et philosophe* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca et Byzantina – Series Academica, 1; Berlin / Boston: De Gruyter, 2020), 337–346.
- Verrycken, Konraad, "Porphyry In Timaeum Fr. XXXVII (Philoponus *De aeternitate mundi contra Proclum* 148 9–23)", *L'Antiquité classique*, 57 (1988), 282–289.
- Villey, Emilie, "Ammonius d'Alexandrie et le Traité sur l'astrolabe de Sévère Sebokht", *Studia Graeco-Arabica*, 5 (2015), 105–128.
- Villey, Emilie, "Quadrivium dans la tradition syriaque", in Houari Touati (ed.), *Encyclopédie de l'humanisme méditerranéen* (<<http://www.encyclopediae-humanisme.com/?Quadrivium-dans-la-tradition-syriaque>>, assessed on 01.10.2020).
- Wachsmuth, Curtius, and Otto Hense (eds.), *Joannis Stobaei Anthologii Libri duo priores* (vols. I–II; Berlin, 1884); *Libri duo posteriores* (vols. III–V; Berlin, 1894–1912).
- Walbridge, John (ed. and transl.), *The Alexandrian Epitomes of Galen. Vol. 1: On the Medical Sects for Beginners, The Small Art of Medicine, On the Elements According to the Opinion of Hippocrates* (Provo: Brigham Young University, 2014).
- Watt, John, "A Portrait of John Bar Aphthonia, Founder of the Monastery of Qenneshre", in Jan W. Drijvers and John W. Watt (eds.), *Portraits of Spiritual Authority: Religious Power in Early*

- Christianity, Byzantium, and the Christian Orient* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World, 137; Leiden / Boston / Köln: Brill, 1999), 155–169.
- Watt, John, “Sergius of Reshaina on the Prolegomena to Aristotle’s Logic: The Commentary on the Categories, Chapter Two”, in Elisa Coda and Cecilia M. Bonadeo (eds.), *De l’Antiquité tardive au Moyen Age: Mélanges offertes à Henri Hugonnard-Roche* (Études Musulmanes, 44; Paris: Vrin, 2014), 31–57.
- Watt, John, “Syriac Philosophy”, in Daniel King (ed.), *The Syriac World* (London / New York: Routledge, 2019), 422–437.
- Watts, Edward, *City and School in Late Antique Athens and Alexandria* (Berkeley et al.: University of California Press, 2008).
- Whittaker, John, “Atticus”, in Richard Goulet (ed.), *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, vol. 1: *Abam(m)on à Axiothéa* (Paris: CNRS, 1989), 664–665.
- Whittaker, John (ed.), Pierre Louis (transl.), *Alcinoos. Enseignement des doctrines de Platon* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1990).
- Wiessner, Gernot, “Zur Handschriftenüberlieferung der syrischen Fassung des *Corpus Dionysiacum*”, *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen I; Philologisch-historische Klasse*, 3 (1972), 165–216.
- Wissowa, Georg (ed.), *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Neue Bearbeitung, 5. Halbband: *Barbarus — Campanus* (Stuttgart, 1897).
- Wright, William, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum, acquired since the Year 1838*, 3 parts (London, 1870–1872).
- Wright, William, with an introduction by Stanley A. Cook, *A Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts Preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1901).
- Zonta, Mauro, “*Nemesiana Syriaca*: New Fragments from the Missing Syriac Version of the *De Natura Hominis*”, *Journal of Semitic Studies*, 36/2 (1991), 223–258.

General Index

- Aba, Ephrem's disciple 16
 Abraham b. Zur'a 7, 37, 79
 Abraham bar Dashandad 3
 Academics 21
 accident 24, 85, 97, 99, 101
 Aeneas of Gaza 60, 61
 Aetius 14, 42, 43, 45, 46, 51, 52
 aim 4, 13, 17, 66, 109, 119
 Alcinous 49, 53, 54, 55
 Alexander of Aphrodisias 21, 65
 Alexandria, Alexandrian 7, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20,
 22–24, 26, 37, 44, 45, 49, 75, 78
 al-Mahdi 3
 al-Ma'mun 28
 al-Qifti 68
 al-Shahrastani 77
 Amelius 17, 63
 Ammonius Hermeiou 18, 19, 22, 23, 49
 Anaxagoras 11, 39, 87, 163
 Anaximenes 11, 39, 87, 163
 anthology 9, 42
 Antioch 10, 26, 27
 Apamea 17
 Aphrahat 15
 apology, apologetic 16, 37, 45, 61, 78
 Apuleius 53, 55
 Arabic 3, 5, 10, 13, 14, 17, 21, 25, 28, 43, 45,
 46, 64, 77, 78, 80
 Aristotle, Aristotelian 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 18–24,
 26, 27, 30–35, 38–42, 44, 46–52, 54, 57,
 60, 64, 67, 69, 70, 72, 73, 77, 89, 101, 125,
 126, 163
 arithmetic 20, 35
 Arius Didymus 42
 astronomy, astronomical 20, 28, 35, 36
 Athanasius of Balad 27, 31, 33, 35, 67, 126
 Athens 57, 61, 66, 72, 77, 78
 Atticus 11, 14, 30, 40, 41, 49, 50, 53, 56–62,
 65, 66, 71, 72, 79, 113, 119, 163
 Baghdad 28, 68, 78
 Bardaisan 11, 14–16
 Barhebraeus 10–15, 37, 62, 66–68, 79, 89
 Basil of Caesarea 27, 28
 body, bodies 4, 8, 9, 21–24, 34, 35, 39, 45, 49,
 55, 56, 59, 60, 62, 63, 65, 70, 72–77, 89, 91,
 93, 105, 107, 109, 111, 117, 119, 121, 123
 Boethius 10, 11, 13, 40, 41, 56, 63–66, 72,
 123, 163
Book of the Laws of the Countries 15
 Byzantium, Byzantine 26, 28
 categories, logical 22, 24, 32, 47, 72, 109
 cause 20, 48, 53, 58, 87, 95, 97, 99, 103, 113,
 117
 Chalcedon 26, 28
 Christian 15–18, 26, 28, 37, 42, 45, 46, 51,
 60, 61, 67, 78
 Church Fathers 27
 Church of the East 3, 10, 37, 79
 Clement of Alexandria 42
 codex 3, 5–10, 12, 14, 20, 24, 25, 38, 67, 79,
 80, 83
 colophon 7
 coming-to-be 44, 97, 99, 107, 115
 commentary 4, 8, 19, 22–25, 35, 40, 41, 44,
 46, 47, 52, 57, 58, 61, 62, 64, 67, 69, 71–
 73, 75, 79, 89, 97, 99, 119
 commentator 42, 49, 56, 58, 61
 compendium 9–11, 13, 20, 25, 34, 37, 42, 46
 composite, composition 47, 56, 74, 91, 95, 97
 cosmos 16, 21, 50, 58, 62, 71
 creation 16, 50, 58, 62, 76, 123
 Creator 21, 56, 59, 73, 76, 113, 115
 curriculum 19, 67
 Cyrenaics 24
 Damascus 10
 DASH 7
 Dayr al-Suryan 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 37, 79, 80
 Demiurge 21, 22, 50, 59, 62, 64
 Democritus 11, 12, 18, 39, 89, 163
 dialectic 43
 Diels, Hermann 41, 42, 44
 Diogenes 11, 39, 87, 163
 Diogenes Laertius 42, 46, 52
 Dionysius the Areopagite, Ps.- 26
 doxography 13, 14, 17, 23, 24, 35, 38, 40–48,
 51, 71, 79, 85

- East Syrian 3, 10, 37, 46, 79
 education 17–20, 25, 26, 45, 46, 66, 68, 72
 Egypt 5, 7, 26, 36, 37
 elements 23, 25, 35, 39, 40, 44, 45, 48, 49,
 51–56, 62, 68, 85, 97, 105
 Empedocles 11, 39, 89, 163
 Empiricist 44
 encyclopedia 10
enkyklios paideia 9, 21
 Ephrem the Syrian 5, 8, 11, 15, 16, 29
 Epicureans 24, 46, 51
 Epicurus 11, 13, 39, 89, 163
 essence 21, 34, 54, 85, 101, 103, 105, 109,
 111, 113
 ethics 16, 43, 57
 Euphrates 27
 Eusebius of Caesarea 15, 42, 49, 50, 57, 64,
 65
 Evagrius Ponticus 17
 evil 70, 121

 figure 22, 23, 35
 form 4, 16, 21, 22, 38–40, 51–56, 58, 59, 64,
 70, 74–77, 89, 93, 95, 99, 103, 105, 111,
 113, 115, 117, 119, 123

 Galen 19, 42, 44, 45
 generation 12, 23, 50–54, 58–62, 73, 76, 87,
 91, 99, 111, 115, 119, 121
 genus 12, 21, 34, 72, 74, 89, 109
 geometry 20, 35, 72
 George of the Arabs 27, 31–35, 125, 126
 gnomonic 9
 God 16, 21, 25, 39, 50, 51, 53, 58–60, 73, 76,
 89, 99, 113, 115, 117, 119, 121, 123
 grammar 9, 20
 Gregory of Nazianzus 18, 27
 Gregory Thaumaturgus 8

 Hellenic 15
 Heraclitus 11, 18, 139, 87, 163
 Hippasus 11, 39, 163
 Hippolytus of Rome 43, 79
 HMML 8
 Homer 14, 39, 87
 Ḥunayn ibn Isḥāq 19, 45
 HUNAYNNET 31, 67, 125, 126

 Iamblichus 17, 49
iatrosophists 19
 Ibn al-Nadīm 68
 Ibn Rushd (Averroes) 77
 idea 4, 38, 39, 41, 50, 53, 95, 99, 101, 113, 119
 intellect 39, 50, 69, 73, 87, 91, 95, 103, 111
 intelligible 39, 47, 70, 91, 111
 introduction 4, 19, 20, 22, 68
 Isaac of Antioch 5
 Isaac of Scetis 29
 Islamic 14, 19, 25, 46

 Jacob of Edessa 27–29, 31–34, 126
 Jacob of Sarug 5
 Jesus Christ 8, 16
 John bar Aphthonia 27
 John Philoponus 19, 60, 61, 75
 John the Solitary 17
 Justin Martyr 36, 42

 knowledge 17, 20, 28, 36, 39, 48

 lacuna 10, 38
 late antiquity 18, 21, 46, 71, 78
 Leucippus 11, 12, 39, 87, 163
 logic 6, 9, 19, 22–25, 27, 29, 34, 47, 49, 50,
 67, 68, 72, 74, 75
 Longinus 13, 40, 41, 63, 64, 66, 72, 77, 123,
 163

 Mani 11, 14
 Mar Abraham, monastery 3
 Mar Mattai, monastery 3, 10, 11, 26, 37, 79
 Maragha 10
 material 35, 39, 85, 87, 93, 99
 mathematics 20, 28, 35, 67
 Matter 4, 14, 22, 23, 38–41, 45, 49–56, 58–
 60, 62, 65, 66, 69, 70, 73–77, 87, 89, 93,
 95, 99, 101, 103, 105, 107, 109, 111, 113,
 115, 117, 119, 121, 123
 medicine 19, 44–46
 Melissus 11, 39, 42, 87, 163
 meteorology 10
 Middle Platonic 14, 20, 41, 49, 53, 55–64, 72,
 73, 79
 Moderatus of Gades 70, 71, 75
 Monad and Dyad 99
 monastery 3, 5, 7, 10, 11, 17, 26, 27, 37, 61,
 67, 79

- motion 21, 35, 40, 53, 58, 59, 65, 85, 87, 95,
 113, 115, 117, 119, 121, 123
 Muslim 10
 mythology 18

 Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī 10
 nature 11, 22–24, 35, 36, 42, 47, 48, 55, 60,
 62, 72, 85, 91, 93, 95, 121
 negation 4, 38, 93, 121
 Neo-Platonism 17, 49, 55, 72
 Neopythagoreanism 72
 Nonnus, scholiast 18
 Numenius 17

 Oceanus 87, 163
 Olympiodorus 19, 23
 opposition 12, 39, 48, 52, 62, 89, 99, 109,
 113, 121
 order 50, 59, 60, 62, 63, 76, 93, 95, 115, 119,
 121, 123
Organon 24, 27, 49, 67
 Origen 17

 pagan 17, 26, 67
 paleography 7
 paradigm 64, 70
 Parmenides 11, 39, 42, 69, 87, 163
 passive 52, 53, 58, 89, 99, 101, 103, 109, 111,
 113
 Paul of Edessa 27
 Paul the Persian 20
 pedagogical 20, 21, 24, 25, 27, 34, 35, 45, 49
 perception, perceptible 39, 47, 48, 59, 91,
 109
 Peripatetic 57, 64
 perishing 44, 97, 99
philoponoi 26, 27, 29, 78
 Philoxenos of Mabbug 29
 Phocas bar Sargis 26, 28, 29
 physics 9, 17, 20, 24, 34, 44, 48, 52, 68, 89
Placita Philosophorum 14, 17, 42, 46, 48, 51
 Plato, Platonic 4, 6, 11, 13, 14, 16–18, 20–23,
 26, 30, 36–41, 45–47, 49–66, 68–73, 75–
 77, 89, 91, 93, 99, 101, 107, 111, 113, 115,
 117, 119, 121, 123, 126, 136, 163
 Plotinus 13, 17, 40, 41, 46, 49, 55, 56, 58, 60,
 61, 63–66, 69, 71–73, 75, 77, 78, 123, 163
 Plutarch 11, 13, 14, 40–42, 45, 46, 56–61, 71,
 119, 163

 polemic 15, 16, 26, 42–46, 51, 57, 60, 63–65,
 67
 Porphyry 8, 13, 16, 20, 23, 27, 31, 34, 41, 45,
 46, 49, 55–80, 119, 126
 potentiality 39, 54–56, 59, 73, 74, 89, 103,
 107, 111, 113, 117, 121
 Pre-Socratics 35, 46, 52
 principle 4, 6, 9, 11–14, 23, 30, 35, 38–42,
 44–53, 56, 58–60, 69, 72, 73, 75, 77, 85,
 87, 89, 91, 93, 95, 97, 99, 101, 103, 109,
 111, 113, 115, 119
 privation 52, 62, 70, 89, 121
 Proclus 23, 57–64, 69, 71, 75, 78
prolegomena 19, 20
 Prophecies of Pagan Philosophers about Christ
 8, 14
 pseudepigrapha 8, 20, 21
 Pythagoras 11, 23, 46, 68, 72
 Pythagoreans 9, 24, 39, 52, 53, 68, 70, 75,
 89, 99, 101, 163

 Qenneshre 27–37, 61, 67, 79
 quadrivium 68
 qualification 39, 43, 51, 56, 59, 60, 72, 74,
 95, 97, 101, 103, 105, 107, 109, 111, 115, 117
 quality 22, 23, 45, 54–56, 70, 74, 97, 101,
 103, 105, 107, 109, 117
 quantity 22, 70, 72, 105, 109

 relatives 109
 Renaissance, Syriac 10
 Rome 66, 72, 77, 79

 Sayings of Greek Philosophers 9
 Sceptics 44
 Scetis 5, 7
 scholia 4, 18, 23, 24, 33, 34, 67, 68
 school 3, 14, 17–20, 23, 24, 41, 44, 45, 66,
 67, 78, 85
 science 10, 14, 19, 20, 28, 35, 39, 47, 49, 67–
 69, 72, 89, 91, 93, 95,
 scribe 6, 7, 9, 28, 32, 67, 80, 83
 Secundus Taciturnus 17
 sensation 54, 91, 111
 Sergius of Resh'ayna 18–24, 26, 27, 31, 32,
 35, 45
 Seven Sages 18
 Severus of Antioch 26, 27
 Severus Sebokht 6, 8, 27–29, 34–37, 79

- Severus, Platonist 11, 13, 14, 40, 41, 56, 58,
 61–63, 66, 72, 77, 79, 119, 123, 163
 Sextus Empiricus 43–46, 79, 126
 Simplicius 19, 42, 44, 46, 52, 53, 57, 69, 72–
 75, 78
 Socrates 42, 54, 85, 101, 163
 Solon 36
 Soul 8, 58–62, 64, 65, 72, 73, 113, 115, 117,
 119, 121
 space 54, 117
 species 4, 12, 21, 24, 34, 37, 50, 105
 Stobaeus 16, 42
 Stoic, Stoics 11, 16, 23, 39, 45, 46, 51–55, 59,
 73, 89, 101, 103, 163
 substance 8, 21, 24, 25, 34, 53, 56, 72, 74, 77,
 89, 101, 109, 115
 Suda 64, 69, 72
 syllogism 34, 35, 47, 50, 74, 75, 91
 Syrian Orthodox 3, 10, 11, 14, 26, 79

 Terentianus Maurus 80
 terminology 28–36, 45, 55, 126
 Tethys 87, 163
 Thales 11, 39, 52, 85, 87, 163

 Theodore Bar Koni 20, 46, 68
 Theodoret of Cyrrhus 45, 46
 theology 10, 11, 20, 37
 Theophrastus 11, 42, 46, 48, 53
 Thomas of Harkel 27
 three-dimensionality 23, 55, 73, 74, 77, 109
 Timothy I 3–6, 9–11, 26, 37, 38, 47, 66, 68,
 79
 translation 3, 5, 13–15, 17–19, 21, 26–37, 45,
 46, 66–68, 79, 125, 126

 universe 11, 16, 25, 44, 53, 56, 60, 62
 Unmoved Mover 21

 void 13, 89

 West Syriac 3, 26, 29, 37
 world 13, 16–18, 21, 22, 40, 50, 58, 60–62,
 70, 73, 75, 76, 89, 119, 121, 123

 Xenophanes 11, 39, 87, 163

 Zeno 23
 Zeus 18

References

a) Ancient Authors

Aeneas of Gaza, *Theophrastus* (ed. Colonna)
46.16–47.2: 60

Alcinous, *Didaskalikos* (ed. Whittaker)
8.2: 54
8.3: 54–55
9: 53

al-Shahrastani, *Kitab al-Milal wa-l-nihal*
(ed. Cureton)
345–346: 77

Apuleius, *De Platone et eius dogmate*
(ed. Moerschini)
I.5: 55

Aristotle
Analytica Posteriora
71b32–72a5: 47–48

Analytica Priora
24a10–11: 33

Metaphysica
988a18: 30
1033a–1033b: 54
Book Alpha: 42
Book Lambda: 21

Physica
184a10–184b14: 48
184b15–25: 42, 48
192a15: 70
Ch. 7: 21

Atticus, *Fragments* (ed. des Places)
Fr. 1–9: 57
Fr. 1: 49
Fr. 4: 50
Fr. 23: 58
Fr. 24: 58
Fr. 26: 59
Fr. 38a–39: 61

Averroes, *Epitome of Aristotle's Metaphysics*
(ed. Rodríguez)
76.6–11: 77

Diogenes Laertius (ed. Dorandi)
VII.134: 52

Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* (ed. Mras & des Places)
XI.1.2: 49, 57
XI.27–28: 64
XIII.17.1–7: 61
XIV.10.3: 64
XIV.14: 42
XV.6.2: 50
XV.10–11: 64
XV.11.2: 65
XV.15–16: 64

(Ps.)Hippolytus, *Refutatio omnium haeresium*
(ed. Marcovich)
X.6.1–3: 43

Homer, *Iliad* (ed. West)
XIV.246: 87

Ibn al-Nadim, *Fihrist* (ed. Flügel)
1.253: 46, 68

(Ps.)Justin Martyr, *Cohortatio ad Graecos*
(ed. Markovich)
Ch. 3–4: 42
Ch. 12: 36

Olympiodorus, *In Arist. Meteor.* (ed. Stüve)
126.14: 35

Philoponus
Contra Proclum (ed. Rabe)
VI.2: 71, 73
VI.14: 75–76
XIV.3: 73

Plato, *Timaeus*
27c–30a: 47
28a: 111
28a1–2: 91, 111
28a1–3: 47
28a2–3: 91, 111

- 28b: 58
 30a2–5: 59
 30a3–6: 71, 115, 119
 30a4–5: 47, 93
 31c–36d: 62
 49a6: 54
 50a: 54
 50c2: 101
 51a–b: 111
 51a4–5: 101, 107
 51a7: 101, 107
 52b: 111
 52b2: 56, 101
 52d2–4: 115
 52d4–5: 107
- Plotin, *Enneads* (ed. Henry & Schwyzer)
 II.4: 73
- Porphyry
Fragments (ed. Smith)
 Fr. 172: 71
 Fr. 232: 69
 Fr. 236: 70
 Fr. 242–250: 64
 Fr. 248: 65
 Fr. 372–378: 16
 Fr. 376: 16
 Fr. 465: 77
- In Plat. Tim.* (ed. Sodano)
 Fr. 47: 76
 Fr. 48–50: 73
 Fr. 49: 76
 Fr. 51: 59
- Sententiae* (ed. Lamberz)
 Sent. 20: 73
 Sent. 42: 73
- Vita Plotini* (ed. Henry & Schwyzer)
 14.10–12: 61
 14.18–20: 63
 19: 63
 20.1–5: 63
- Proclus
In Plat. Tim. (ed. Diehl)
 I 14.7–8: 63
 I 204.17–18: 61
 I 224.17: 62
 I 289.6–13: 62
- I 322.20–24: 64
 I 381.26–382.3: 58
 I 382.12–383.22: 73
 I 384.2–5: 58
 I 391.4–6: 71
 I 391.4–12: 59
 I 393.14: 71
 I 393.31: 71
 I 394.25–29: 75
 I 395.10: 71
 III 212.8–9: 61
- Theol. Plat.* (ed. Saffrey & Westerink)
 51.4–11: 69
- Ps.-Nonnus, *Scholia on the Orations of Gregory of Nazianzus* (ed. Nimmo Smith)
 Scholion 4.37: 18
- Ps.-Plutarch, *Placita Philosophorum* (ed. Diels)
 I.1.2: 51
 I.3: 53
 I.9.7: 55
- Sergius of Resh‘ayna
Commentary on Categories, to Theodore (unpubl.)
 Intr.: 19
 Ch. 2: 21
 Ch. 3: 23
 Ch. 4: 23
- Introduction to Aristotle and his Categories*, to Philotheos (ed. Aydin)
 §3: 19
 §65: 22
- Severus (Middle Platonist), *Fragments* (ed. Gioè)
 Test. 3: 61
 Test. 6: 62
 Test. 8: 61
 Fr. 1: 61
- Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus Mathematicos* (ed. Mutschmann)
 X, 310–318: 44
- Simplicius, *In Arist. Phys.* (ed. Diels)
 9.11–15: 72
 25–26: 44

26.11–13:	53
149.11–18:	46
163.16–20:	46
165.8–10:	46
166.3–5:	46
181.7–10:	52
188.32–189.1:	46
229.16–230.14:	74
231.5–24:	69–70
Stobaeus, <i>Eclogae</i> (ed. Wachsmuth)	
l.11.5:	55
l.3.96:	16
<i>Suda</i> (ed. Adler)	
2098:	64, 69
Terentianus Maurus, <i>De Syllabis</i> (ed. Keil)	
1286:	80
Theodoret, <i>De Graecarum affectionum curatione</i> (ed. Scholten)	
§95:	45
Theophrastus (ed. Fortenbaugh)	
Fr. 230:	53
Timothy I, <i>Letters</i> (ed. Heimgartner)	
Letter 43:	4

b) Syriac Manuscripts

Alqosh, Chaldean Diocese, Syr. 61:	25, 68
Baghdad, Chaldean Monastery, ms. 171:	27
Baghdad, Chaldean Monastery, ms. 509:	3
Berlin, Petermann I 9 (Sachau 88):	19, 68
Berlin, Syr. 190 (Sachau 81):	11
Cambridge, Add. 2812:	27, 68
Dayr al-Suryan, Syr. 20:	16
Dayr al-Suryan, Syr. 27:	5–14, 24, 34, 38, 62, 66–69, 79, 80, 83
Dayr al-Suryan, Syr. 28:	25
Jerusalem, St. Mark's Mon., Syr. 135:	11
London, BL Add. 12151:	26
London, BL Add. 12155:	24
London, BL Add. 12167:	7
London, BL Add. 12170:	80
London, BL Add. 14620:	17
London, BL Add. 14650:	7
London, BL Add. 14658:	8, 9, 20, 24
London, BL Add. 14668:	7
London, BL Add. 17130:	7
London, BL Add. 17156:	27
London, BL Add. 17194:	7
London, BL Add. 17215:	25
London, BL Add. 18819:	7
London, BL Add. 18821:	24
Mardin, Church of the Forty Martyrs, 404:	8
Paris, BnF Syr. 210:	11
Sinai, Syr. 16:	8
Vatican, Syr. 158:	67
Vatican, Syr. 168:	11
Vatican, Syr. 586:	33

